DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 051 436 AA 000 708

TITLE	Early Childhood Development: Alternatives for Program Implementation in the States. A Report of the Education Commission of the States Task Force on Early Childhood Education.
INSTITUTION	Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.
PUB DATE	Jun 71
NOTE	103p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Education Commission of the States, 300 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203 ($1.00)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Organization, Certification, Developmental Programs, *Early Childhood Education, Educational Facilities, Educational Finance, *Educational Innovation, Educational Objectives, Federal Government, Kindergarten, *Preschool Programs, Public Education, *State Action, State Aid, *State Programs, Training

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this report is to provide state-level policy makers with basic data about important alternatives to be considered as a state initiates or expands its early childhood programs. The report points out that several effective approaches could be implemented at substantially less cost than conventional classroom kindergartens and preschools. The major goals of statewide programs for children under 6 years of age should be to: (a) strengthen the family role and involve parents in the education of their children; (b) provide for the health, safety, and psychological needs of young children; and (c) provide remedial health and education programs for all preschool children in need of special services. An analysis of federal priorities and programs indicates that states will be required to carry the major burden of early childhood programs and coordinate them with the many ongoing federal programs. Topics discussed are: state organizational structure; alternative approaches; objectives; training and certifying personnel; physical facilities; methods of providing state financial support; and implementation. Appendixes present a discussion of educational goals; a summary of pending federal legislation; and information on state funding and personnel programs in early childhood development. Also included are addresses of people to contact for additional information on individual states. (Author/NH)

ED 051 436

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Early Childhood Development

Alternatives for Program Implementation in the States

AA 000 708

A report of

the Education Commission of the States

June 1971

task force members

Governor Calvin Rampton, Utah
Chairman

Milton Akers, Executive Director
National Association for the Education of Young Children

Dr. Rebecca Baker
Vice President, Nursery School
Association for Childhood Education International

Robert W. Blanchard
Superintendent of Schools
Portland, Oregon

Mrs. Nikki Blankenship
Early Childhood Bilingual Program
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Austin, Texas

Howard Bray, Deputy Director
The Appalachian Regional Commission

Preston Bruce, Director
Four-C Division
Office of Child Development, H.E.W.

Benjamin Carmichael, Director
Appalachian Educational Laboratory
Charleston, West Virginia

Mrs. Constance Cook
Member, New York State Assembly

Mrs. Barbara Finberg, Executive Associate
Carnegie Corporation of New York

Mrs. March K. Fong
California State Representative

D. Robert Graham
Florida State Senator

Dr. Dorothy Gregg
Assistant to Director of Public Relations
U. S. Steel, New York City

Orval Hansen, Idaho
U. S. House of Representatives

Walter Hodges, Director
Southwest Center for Early Childhood Personnel Development
State College of Arkansas, Conway

Robert E. McNair
Governor of South Carolina, 1965-71

Allison D. McNay
School and College Relations
Standard Oil Company, San Francisco

Mrs. Ray E. Miller
Fargo, North Dakota Board of Education

John H. Niemeyer, President
Bank Street College, New York

Mrs. Rachael Noel
Denver, Colorado Board of Education

John Sessions, Assistant Director
AFL-CIO Education Department
Washington, D. C.

Jule Sugarman, Administrator
Human Resources Administration
New York City

Daniel B. Taylor
Superintendent of Public Instruction
West Virginia

Mrs. Anne G. White
Chief, Bureau of Child Development
Department of Health and Social Services
Delaware

Burton White
Harvard Graduate School of Education

Consultant

Glen Nimnicht
Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development
Berkeley, California

Official Observers

Mrs. Elizabeth Lewis
Santa Ana College, California

William Rapp, Vice President
Federation of Rocky Mountain States

Darrell Renstrom, Legislative Consultant
National Education Association

Education Commission of the States

Governor Russell Peterson
Delaware, ECS Chairman, 1970-71

Wendell H. Pierce
Executive Director

James A. Hazlett, Director
Elementary-Secondary Education

Mrs. Sally V. Allen
Project Coordinator

Early Childhood Development

Alternatives for Program Implementation in the States

A report of
The Education Commission of the States
Task Force on Early Childhood Education

June 1971

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY Education Commission of the States
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Additional copies of this report may be obtained for $1.00 from the Education Commission of the States, 300 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203.

© 1971 Education Commission of the States

contents

Foreword . . . 3
Summary of Recommendations and Alternatives . . . 5
The Need for State-Supported Early Childhood Programs . . . 12
Objectives of a Public Early Childhood Program . . . 16
The Influence of the Federal Government . . . 22
Organizational Structure at the State Level . . . 26
Alternative State Program Approaches . . . 33
Priorities and Methods for Implementation . . . 51
Training and Certifying Quality Personnel . . . 55
Providing Adequate Physical Facilities . . . 60
Funding State Early Childhood Programs . . . 62
Implementation . . . 71
Appendix A: Educational Programs, Goals for Children . . . 74
Appendix B: Summary of Proposed Federal Legislation . . . 79
Appendix C: Summary of State Programs . . . 81

The photographs on the cover and in this report were taken by Mrs. Doris Siegert, a free lance photographer living in Denver whose special interest is in working with Head Start children.

foreword

The Education Commission of the States has expressed continuing concern about early childhood education in the conviction that the states must accord higher priority to the formative years before first grade. In the face of inadequate resources and conflicting pressures for funds, however, few states have been able or willing to allocate significant emphasis to the preprimary years. And there has been little information available to indicate the variety of possible approaches and their relative costs to interested law makers, educators and citizens.

This report is intended to provide state-level policy makers with basic data about the most important alternatives which should be considered as a state initiates or expands its programs for very young children. It points out that several effective approaches could be implemented at substantially less cost than conventional classroom kindergartens and preschools. It is the work of a 24-member task force on early childhood education, appointed in the fall of 1970 and funded with a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. An initial background paper was drafted by Dr. Glen Nimnicht of the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. It was further developed by Mrs. Sally V. Allen, ECS project coordinator, in light of task force meetings in December 1970 and February 1971. This report, which was approved by the ECS steering committee in April 1971, is the result. Dr. Nimnicht served as consultant to the task force throughout its deliberations.

Included here also are several tables which indicate ongoing state efforts in kindergarten and prekindergarten programs. The

information has been compiled on the basis of questionnaires distributed to the states.

The task force, whose members include political and educational leaders concerned about early childhood development, represents varied backgrounds and outlooks from across the country. Our discussions have, to say the least, been lively. It was never assumed that such a diverse group could agree unanimously on the wide range of issues covered in this report. But there is strong agreement among the task force members that the report presents the most effective and feasible ways that states might initiate and develop programs for children younger than six. It is hoped that the Education Commission of the States will be able to assist states in their effort to implement the report.

Special mention should be made of the contributions of James Hazlett, ECS director of elementary and secondary education, who has provided general direction of the ECS early childhood program; Russell Vlaanderen, ECS director of research who assisted in the research aspects of the project; and Adrienne Sack who, with devotion and good humor, typed innumerable versions of this report.

Calvin L. Rampton, Governor of Utah
Chairman, ECS Early Childhood
Education Task Force

The Education Commission of the States is a non-profit organization formed by interstate compact in 1966. Forty-three states and territories are now members. Its goal is to further a working relationship among state governors, legislators and educators for the improvement of education. This report is an outcome of one of many Commission undertakings at all levels of education. The Commission offices are located at 300 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203.

summary of recommendations and alternatives

The states should provide support for developmental programs for children younger than six, the standard first grade entry age. The major thrust of such programs should be (a) strengthening the role of the family as the first and most fundamental influence on child development; (b) the early detection of serious health and education handicaps; and (c) the provision of remedial health and education programs for all preschool children who need special services.

A statewide, publicly supported early education effort should be based on the following minimum objectives:

1. To develop ways to reach the families of young children and to strengthen their capacity for parenting.
2. To involve parents in the formal education of their children directly and through the decision-making process.
3. To provide for the health, safety and psychological needs of young children.
4. To start the educational process that will contribute to the development of individuals who will be able to solve a variety of problems and are willing to try to solve them.
5. To lay a foundation for improvements that should take place in the early years of schooling to make it more responsive to the needs of children.

An analysis of federal priorities and programs indicates that it will be up to the states to carry the major burden of early childhood programs and to coordinate their efforts with the many ongoing federally supported programs. Indications are that in the near future, federal legislation will require a coordinated state planning mechanism. Coordination of the more than 300 federal programs for young children, administered by 18 agencies, is urgently needed.

Organizational Structure at the State Level

How early childhood programs are administered at the state level will substantially affect the impact and nature of the state effort. The primary need is for a mechanism to coordinate overlapping federal and state programs.

Whatever agency is assigned or created to assume general responsibility for the administration of state early childhood programs, it should have at least the following functions:

a. To supervise all state and federal funds for early childhood programs;

b. To analyze, make recommendations about and coordinate all state and federally funded programs for the development of early childhood personnel;

c. To develop a master plan for early childhood programs, staff and funding across the state;

d. To analyze and develop recommendations for state certification efforts related to early childhood personnel;

e. To develop a system of early diagnosis of children's needs and of parental training and involvement in their children's education;

f. To make recommendations regarding state standards for private, particularly franchised, early childhood programs;

g. To serve as an advocate and promoter of programs to meet the needs of all young children in the state and to stimulate the development of postsecondary and inservice training programs for early childhood personnel.

Alternative structures to be considered include:

1. Assignment of general responsibility for early childhood programs to an existing agency already administering programs, such as the state department of education, health or social services. A division of early childhood education should be established within the department and be headed by a professional with sufficient rank and responsibility to be of influence.

2. The establishment of an office of child development as an independent state agency, headed by a commissioner of child development appointed by the governor, to administer all state programs for children younger than six. A special advi-

sory board of heads of public and private agencies concerned with early childhood would be created.

3. The establishment of a state child care coordinating council in the governor's office. Members would represent parents, public agencies and private groups with an interest in children's services. The council would be responsible for statewide planning, coordination and evaluation.

Alternative State Program Approaches

The recommendations and alternatives suggested for state action are based upon four assumptions: (1) the state has a responsibility to the total population; (2) the states must develop some equitable basis for the allocation of funds; (3) a state program should take into consideration the possible participation by other agencies in the funding of programs; (4) a state will probably have to phase in the program over a number of years.

The alternatives include:

1. States should consider a comprehensive approach including children younger than three and their parents because, after the initial expense, such a program could be operated at low cost; the ability to make early diagnoses would strengthen all other programs; and some day care services will be required for the age group in any case. Such a program would be developed through demonstration/parent education centers with diagnostic services and day care programs.

2. States should consider programs for three-, four- and five-year-old children which provide training for them and their parents in their homes.

   a. Several programs could be developed which provide limited training for parents to work with their own children, such as a parent/child toy lending library.

   b. Parent-oriented television programming, building on Sesame Street or a similar series, could be used to assist parents to work with their children and maximize existing children's television programs.

   c. Either of the two above approaches could be rendered more effective at relatively little additional cost by adding a home visit by a qualified professional teacher or aide who would work with both parents and children in the home situation.

   d. Special television programs for children, like Sesame Street, could offer important early educational opportunities, al-

though they should not be expected to fill children's needs without supplementary efforts.

3. A combined approach, which provides a classroom experience for children in addition to a home visit program and uses television as an instructional aid, offers the benefits of parent involvement in education at home but also social growth by giving children practice in sharing and working together in a group.

4. States should consider alternative programs for three-, four- and five-year-olds in a classroom situation.

a. The state might provide aid to children to attend existing private preschool and/or kindergarten programs if no public programs exist.

b. The state might encourage the expansion of day care programs and provide support for an educational component in them, including special staff training and provisions for parental involvement.

c. An effective state program could be developed by expanding the existing Head Start effort to more five-, four- and three-year-olds. Special steps should be taken to avoid administrative duplication. It might not be necessary to provide supportive health, dental and nutritional services to all youngsters.

d. Television programs, like Sesame Street, could be used to supplement educational efforts. One possibility is to build classroom efforts around T.V., bringing children and teachers together to view the program and then expand on it.

e. It is not recommended that states establish formal classroom preschool programs for all three- and four-year-olds because there is no evidence that all children need a structured group experience if they are receiving some kind of systematic training and because there are viable, less expensive alternatives.

f. Where states have already initiated kindergarten programs for five-year-olds, these programs should be retained but revitalized through such efforts as substantial state support; flexible certification laws; minimum instructional standards; special programs for parent involvement; and single sessions.

g. The states should develop methods to regulate the standards of private kindergartens, particularly those being established in the rapidly expanding franchising effort, but flexibility should be key.

Priorities and Methods for Implementation

It is assumed that even if a state chooses low cost parent/child programs, limitations of resources and staff will necessitate the establishment of initial priorities. The following alternative priorities are suggested.

1. If a state is able to predict a lack of trained personnel for kindergarten and prekindergarten programs, it might adopt as its first priority the development of postsecondary and in-service programs for professional and other positions.
2. A state might focus first on the development of an early diagnosis system—and personnel to administer it—which would determine the need for various alternative programs.
3. The state could consider establishing a limited number of model demonstration centers, but the federal government has developed a number of such centers which should fulfill the need for experimental programs.
4. Another approach would be to serve first the children with the greatest need, particularly those from low-income homes, of ethnic and minority groups and the handicapped.
5. The beginnings of a state program might be developed by state subsidization of an educational component at existing day care and industrially established centers for four- and five-year-olds.

Training and Certifying Quality Personnel

Teachers and administrators for early childhood education must evidence qualifications and training different from their counterparts working with older children. Certification procedures and teacher training programs should reflect this fact. For the effective implementation of the program alternatives outlined in this report, a new type of professional early childhood educator will be required.

To meet personnel needs for early childhood education programs, states should take some or all of the following steps:

1. Establish credentials in early childhood education or at least provide for a strong specialization in early childhood education within the preparation of an elementary certificate.
2. Establish the same salary schedules, fringe benefits and tenure rights for early childhood teachers as for all other teachers.

3. Encourage the development of postsecondary and inservice programs for professional and other positions, through a variety of actions.
4. Develop programs particularly suited to training teaching aides, parents, siblings and other young people to assist with the wide range of program alternatives.
5. Organize and train volunteers as teachers' assistants.

Providing Adequate Physical Facilities

If a state determines that its needs for additional facilities for early childhood programs will be substantial, it might examine carefully and consider revision of existing legislation and regulations related to classroom space. The success of Head Start programs in non-school space suggests that — with full recognition of the complications involved — the time has come for code revision.

In all state efforts to develop facilities and regulate their standards, there must be basic recognition of the need for flexibility in creative design and adequate provision for state aid for construction where funds are needed.

Methods of Providing State Financial Support

The states must develop sound principles of financing for their early childhood programs, including provisions so that (1) early childhood education is treated as an integral part of the state's overall education program, (2) it will benefit from a steady flow of state funds, and that (3) funds can be provided on an equalization basis to insure that particularly needy districts benefit.

Cost estimates are included for the alternative program approaches outlined.

Within this framework states should consider some or all of the following techniques:

1. Inclusion of early childhood programs in the state foundation formula, if the foundation program has proven to be an effective method of distributing state aid.
2. Establishment of a special early childhood education fund within the state's education budget, if there is not an effective foundation program and no immediate plans for establishing one.

3. Establishment of a special state fund to include all expenditure for early childhood programs (including education, health, nutrition, day care, etc.).
4. Provision for construction funds for early childhood facilities.
5. Provision to ensure maximum use of federal matching funds and adoption of the principle by the state agency administering early childhood programs that priority will be given to plans using matching funds or joint federal or other public or private funding.
6. Development of a program of incentive grants to state colleges, universities, junior and community colleges for offering graduate, undergraduate and associate degree specializations in early childhood education.
7. Adoption of the principle that salaries for early childhood teachers should be equal to those of elementary school teachers and provision made so that whatever state support is provided for elementary teachers salaries is also provided to early childhood teachers.
8. Provision of parent education as an integral part of the state early childhood and/or adult education programs.

Implementation

Included among the steps a state should devise to insure consideration and assist in implementation of the alternatives outlined in this report are (1) public examination of the issue at a prominent level of government; (2) collection of essential data; and (3) identification of an interagency committee to oversee the implementation process. A governor's conference on early childhood education might be the first step.

The key decision will be the structure to be adopted for administration of early childhood programs. Alternative program and funding approaches will be largely determined by this decision. The Education Commission of the States stands ready to assist the states in development of model legislation, identifying consultants to assist with legislative and administrative matters and program development and to conduct continued research on best practices across the country.

the need for state-supported early childhood programs

In the coming decade, the states will be subject to increasing and widespread pressure to provide special educational services to very young children and their parents. There has already been a large increase in the number of three- and four-year-olds enrolled in nursery schools and kindergartens. According to the U.S. Census Bureau one in ten children of these ages was enrolled in some kind of formal preschool program in 1965; in 1970 the figure was one in five. About two-thirds of the increased enrollment is accounted for by federal child care programs begun since 1965.

The success of these federally funded programs, which aim primarily to enhance the early development of disadvantaged youngsters, has led other families to demand the same "head start" for their children. Although private schools are expanding and national business organizations are beginning to franchise nursery schools, tuition fees range from $500 to $1,000. But, perhaps three-fifths of the population have incomes high enough to prevent their children from attending Head Start and yet cannot afford private programs. They are disenchanted with the concentrated expenditure of their tax dollars on the disadvantaged, and they are demanding public preschools and kindergartens for their children.

Additional immediate pressure will come from families who want day care for their children while the mothers work. An estimated eight out of ten working mothers of preschool-age children are not now eligible for the majority of federal or state-supported programs. There are more than 11.6 million mothers with jobs today; more than four million of them have children under six. But only 640,000 licensed day care spaces are available, and more than one-third of these are privately run. By 1980, the Labor Department predicts, 5.3 million mothers with small children will be working.

And there is significant agreement that custodial care is not enough, that the first five or six years are of crucial importance to an individual's development. These are the years of most rapid intellectual growth. These are the years when the ways of thinking and behaving which will guide the mental development of the individual through the rest of his life are being formed. Most educational problems start before a child enters first grade. To deal with the cause rather than the effect, efforts should start well before the child is six.

The question is not whether the states should become involved. To a large extent they already are. Eight states (three by 1973) and Guam mandate kindergarten programs and at least 37 have adopted legislation permitting them. Thirty-eight states, American Samoa and Puerto Rico make some form of state aid available for kindergartens, and at least six provide some funding for preschool programs. But much of the recent impetus has come from the federal government—whose purpose has been to provide educational training for the children of the poor and day care services to welfare mothers who might then be able to go to school or be trained to get a job. And often state involvement has followed—in an uncoordinated array of day care programs or health provisions or locally initiated classroom efforts approved but not funded by the state. In many cases, state interest in early childhood training has simply been a recognition of an established situation.

But the situation is getting out of hand. Direction is needed. If the states are to determine their own priorities and program emphases, they must assume the leadership now. There needs to be a clear notion of what people can expect to accomplish in early childhood education programs. Early childhood education is not a panacea for the social ills of our society; but it certainly is a prerequisite to solving many of these problems

Early Education as an Investment

To the extent that an educational program for young children contributes to their success as students and citizens, it will significantly reduce subsequent remedial, counseling and even penal and welfare costs. There are no definitive statistics on how much a state might save in the long term by investing in early childhood education. And there is not yet enough experience to analyze precisely the relationship of early training to prevention of later problems.

But it is clear that a relationship exists. Failure in the initial years of formal education can be closely tied to the high percentage of

drop-outs in the public schools. It costs approximately twice as much to retain a child in a mentally retarded or remedial classroom as in a regular classroom. Once in a special class, he usually remains there at least eight years. And yet, for example, over half the Spanish-surnamed and Negro children in mentally retarded classrooms in California have the ability to be in regular classrooms and have been misclassified because they lacked early training in English and the basic skills demanded by the public schools. It costs per year, on a national average, $4,070 to detain a juvenile, $1,898 to keep an individual in a state penitentiary, and about $1,000 for an individual on welfare.

In fact, early childhood programs can be considered integrally related to overall state economic development. A 1967-68 financial study prepared by Moody's Investors Associates and Campus Facilities Associates for the State of South Carolina linked implementation of a state kindergarten program to the state's total manpower resources and the overall drive for economic growth. In addition to long-range development, the report estimated that the effect of preschool and kindergarten programs would be to reduce the number of first grade repeaters and result in a savings of at least $2.5 million a year. Resultant support from the legislature and the governor led to the initiation of a kindergarten program in 1970.

Over a long period of time, there will be cost benefits in terms of reduced expenditures for special and remedial education, delinquency and crime, and an increase in the general productivity of society. But it would be a mistake to expect an immediate measurable payoff; education and other social services generally do not work that way. It would be a disservice to sell a developmental program for young children solely on the basis of some immediate cost-benefit analysis. Expectations are bound to be disappointed because the real values have been overlooked, and the short-term payoff will not be as spectacular as hoped.

The immediate tangible pay-off of early childhood programs should be:

1. Improving the inadequate day care situations to which many children in this country are now exposed.
2. Detecting and preventing future problems for the 10 to 15 percent of children who might be physically or mentally handicapped or have learning disabilities.
3. Providing help to any parent wanting to become a more effective parent.

State Support for Early Childhood Programs

A state can realize substantial political, social, educational and economic benefits if it provides early developmental programs for children younger than six—the standard first grade entry age. The major thrust of such programs should be (a) strengthening the role of the family as the first and most fundamental influence on child development; (b) the early detection of serious health and education handicaps; and (c) the provision of remedial health and education programs for all preschool children who need special services.

Recognizing the magnitude of the task, the wide variations in children's needs and the already existing demands on state resources, the task force has focused on the development of alternative approaches and organizational structures which might be implemented at different levels by states with different needs. As a minimum, states should provide some form of development program for three-, four- and five-year-olds and should—as much as possible—involve their parents in the process. There are many public and private efforts across the country which indicate the benefits to the national welfare of concern for the health of expectant mothers, of provision of an adequate diet for newborn and very young children and of education for prospective and new parents. Therefore this report looks at programs for mothers' prenatal and postnatal care and parent education as one very important alternative for state support.

objectives of a public early childhood program

In order to realize a state's general goals in developing comprehensive preprimary programs—enriching educational experiences, meeting increasing demand and reducing later remedial and other costs—the immediate program objectives must be considered and defined.

For a statewide, publicly supported effort, we recommend a set of minimum objectives which recognize the social, educational and health needs of all children:

1. To develop ways to reach the families of young children and to strengthen their capacity for parenting.
2. To involve parents in the formal education of their children directly and through the decision-making process.
3. To provide for the health, safety and psychological needs of young children.
4. To start the educational process that will contribute to the development of individuals who will be able to solve a variety of problems and are willing to try to solve them.
5. To lay a foundation for improvements that should take place in the early years of schooling to make it more responsive to the needs of children.

These objectives are discussed below:

1. ***To develop ways to reach the families of young children and to strengthen their capacity for parenting.*** There is important evidence that in the earliest years children are more influenced by family than by peers or any persons outside the family. Parents are in fact primarily—and in most cases exclusively—respon-

sible for early childhood development. Some families are now getting their children off to a good start. Some are not. The overriding aim of states should be to strengthen the family as the primary group responsible for the development and education of young children and to meet the special needs of parents.

At least from a conventional point of view, the family is strengthened when one parent (usually the father) can earn an adequate living and another parent (usually the mother) can remain in the home to provide for the welfare and development of the children. Some women need an outside stimulus to maintain a healthy mental state. That choice should be available without sacrificing the welfare of their children. The family is strengthened when it is more self-sufficient and does not have to depend upon outside agencies for service that can be provided internally and when the education the children receive outside the home respects the language, culture and life style of the home.

The priorities that follow are:

- To assist the family in providing a healthy stimulating environment for the children in the home. Many parents need help to understand the process of child growth and development, how children learn and how parents can assist in the process. This is important to foster both the child's development and the parents' self-confidence.

- To supplement the efforts of the home by providing limited educational opportunities outside the home ranging from special services covering an hour or two a week to three or four hours of classroom activities a day.

- To provide adequate day care services for those families needing it. When it is necessary to provide complete day care service, it should be conducted by someone who knows, understands and respects the cultural background of the child. Many parents have no alternative but to leave their child alone, with a babysitter or in a day care program that just manages to provide minimal custodial services. A working mother's income is often the difference between being impoverished and not being. In 1968 in the male-headed families in which the wife worked, without the woman's salary eight percent of the families would have had less than $3,000 a year and 40 percent would have had between $3,000 and $7,000 a year. These women do not qualify for most of the existing federally subsidized programs because they are working. And yet as much as a third or more of their income may go for inadequate services for their children.

2. ***To involve parents in the formal education of their children directly and through the decision-making process.*** When children are young, it is easier to involve their parents in the activities and program development of the schools. There seems to be a natural tendency for parents of a preschool-age youngster to hold high aspirations for him—regardless of what may have happened to his older brothers and sisters. And early involvement of parents can help to head off later conflicts between home and the schools—particularly when racial or ethnic groups are concerned.

As many parents as possible should be encouraged to participate in the program for their children by being paid assistants or volunteers in the classroom, attending parent meetings or through an outreach program in which teachers or parent coordinators go to the homes of the parents who cannot come to the school.

Representative groups of parents should be involved in the decision-making process by serving on advisory councils similar to the Head Start Parent Advisory Groups. If such groups are formed, their function should be clear, and their recommendations should carry real weight in the decision-making process. This becomes extremely important particularly when nimority groups or low-income parents are involved. The success of efforts such as Head Start and Follow Through to reverse the disastrous educational results of the majority of children from low income and minority groups depends to a great extent on involving the parents to help them understand what the educators are trying to accomplish and to help the educators become more responsive to the children and the parents. Unless this kind of bridging between the schools and the parents can be accomplished, there is little hope for the success of these educational programs. The schools simply cannot accomplish the task alone. And, of course, it is implied that the parents would be helping to redefine the tasks that the schools are attempting to accomplish.

3. ***To provide for the health, safety and psychological needs of young children.*** Regardless of where education takes place—in the child's home, in a day care home or in a classroom—a major objective must be the physical and mental welfare of the children. There are significant problems of providing adequate physical facilities, of determining standards and licensing to insure that children are in a safe environment that protects them from physical harm and nurtures their physical development.

In addition to these concerns, the psychological needs of the children must be taken into account. A quality program (a) should

provide the psychological services which some young children with serious problems need to become mentally healthy individuals and which are not now available; (b) should protect children from psychological damage resulting from the overexpectations of parents or teachers; and (c) should promote the development of a healthy self-concept which research indicates is essential for later success in school.

In considering the physical and psychological health of young children, it becomes particularly clear that concern for human development cannot be imposed at an arbitrary age level. It has been estimated that if the needs of expectant mothers were adequately met, the number of mentally retarded children could be reduced by as much as 50 percent. Unless an adequate diet is provided for newborn and very young children, their physical and mental development can be stunted. And for long-range health and development, prospective parents and the parents of very young children should be offered parent education programs. This training in human growth and development should start when prospective parents are still in school, although for most individuals the motivation to learn will be greater when they become expectant parents. Certainly at that time and extending over the next several years, there would be great benefits if education for parents, explaining in detail how children grow and develop, were available to all. This is of prime importance because the parents' understanding in large part determines the health, safety and psychological well being of the children.

4. ***To start the educational process that will contribute to the development of individuals who will be able to solve a variety of problems and are willing to try to solve them.*** There are mixed opinions on how to start very young children on an educational process that will contribute to their full development. Some educators and psychologists believe that objectives should be stated in very explicit terms (such as the child can count to ten, name nine colors, etc.) and the program should be systematically designed to accomplish them. Others stress language development, concept formation and problem-solving, but are not as concerned about the specific content. They devote considerable attention to helping children either maintain or develop a healthy self-concept as it relates to learning and school.

Clearly no single set of objectives would satisfy the leading educators and psychologists who are involved in developing model programs. But in many instances these differences are matters of approach and stress.

Experts recognize the importance of early intellectual development, but only as a part of early childhood education. Most authorities agree that it is important also to help young children develop social skills and a healthy self-concept. In addition they recognize the importance of individualizing the program to respond to the ability and needs of individual children.

Human beings and particularly young children vary greatly in their rate of growth and development as well as in their potential to learn. Children from different backgrounds have learned different things that are vital to them but are not necessarily the things the school values in a child. A child from a middle-class family comes the closest to having the prerequisites the school usually expects. A child from the ghetto may have learned how to care for himself all day on a city street or how to look after younger brothers and disters. The rural child may have developed capabilities appropriate to his environment. Or a child may come to school with a well-developed language, but it is Navaho or Spanish or different from the English used in school. We cannot expect these children to achieve the same objectives as those set for a child who comes to school speaking the language of the school and tutored previously in some of the things the school expects.

For a more complete discussion of educational goals, see Appendix A.

5. ***To lay a foundation for changes that should take place in the early years of school to make it more responsive to the needs of the children.*** One of the objectives of education before the age of six should be to foster changes in the public schools. Rather than starting at the top—in colleges and universities—and working down in order to effect change, early childhood education offers the opportunity to start with the young child and work up. To suggest that the schools should change is not an attack on the schools, their teachers or administrators. It is a recognition that any social institution should be constantly engaged in the process of self-renewal—changing its form and content to adjust to changing social needs and demands.

If a developmental program before the age of six is to have long-term positive effects, it should be carried on into the school years. One of the implications, of course, is that the educational and related objectives of the school will need to be more broadly defined to correspond with the general objectives outlined above. This will probably be a long-term objective. It would be a mistake to plan any preschool pro-

gram without taking into account the current structure, curriculum and procedures in the early grades of the elementary school and the effects that the developmental program before age six will have on that program.

In short, an immediate objective is to help young children succeed in the schools as they presently operate. A long-range objective is to project the kind of changes that would be desirable to make the early years of education more productive for more children.

If early childhood educational programs are going to help children be more successful in schools as they are, the programs must anticipate some of the schools' expectations. An obvious example is the development of language. Probably the best approach to language development for a Spanish-speaking child would be to continue to develop his language (Spanish) and use it in the classroom, but if English is the basic instructional language in kindergarten or the first grade, one of the objectives of the prekindergarten programs would have to be to help him understand and speak English. This should remain an objective only as long as it takes to change the approach in the early years of school.

As a long-range objective, an early childhood educational and developmental program should lay the foundation for the following kinds of changes in the public schools:

- A restatement of the basic purpose of public education. Instead of blending divergent groups into a single homogeneous mass, the aim should be to develop different cultures and life styles, enhancing their values and uniqueness and, in the process, enhancing the whole society. Schools probably will not be successful with many children from minority groups until they do reflect these differences. Minority groups have always resisted the efforts of the majority group to assimilate them. A diversity of views and approaches probably will enrich our society.

- The public schools need to learn to respond to different children and their parents on an individual basis. The soundest process of education starts with the known and proceeds to teach the unknown. The process should start with the child's language, his culture and his background and build on that base.

- The public schools need a broader definition of objectives. Intellectual objectives need to be expanded to include more emphasis on problem-solving, and general objectives need to be expanded beyond intellectual development to include the physical and mental health of children.

the influence of the federal government

The federal government has played a key role in focusing attention on the significance of early childhood development in this country. Its importance and effectiveness have been demonstrated through federally supported programs, particularly, of course, the Head Start and subsequently developed Follow Through programs. Head Start now involves approximately 480,000 children with an average expenditure per child for a full academic year of $1,050. For school year 1969-70, the total number of children served in the Follow Through program will be about 35,000 at a cost of approximately $800 per child. This includes the cost of developing and evaluating model programs. After the developmental process is over, the cost would be reduced by a substantial amount.

Research in early childhood education has been advanced considerably through federal support and special projects. The National Laboratory for Early Childhood Education, established in 1967, is a network of seven university-based centers under the leadership of a National Coordination Center, the Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory in St. Louis, Missouri. In addition, early childhood development programs are being operated by at least six of the federal Regional Education Laboratories.

Current federal efforts also include some centralization of information about on-going research projects in early childhood education. The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), designed and supported by the U.S. Office of Education, includes a clearinghouse at the University of Illinois at Urbana whose focus is early childhood education. ERIC collects, summarizes, indexes and disseminates research and development materials as well as analyzing and interpreting the data.

Through planned variation in the Head Start and Follow Through programs, the federal government provides a number of model demonstration centers that offer important materials for others developing programs. Parent and Child Centers, operated through HEW's Office of Child Development, are developing useful data on assistance to parents both before and after their children are born.

Recent federal legislation has offered interesting incentives to industry to enter the early childhood field. Amendments to the Labor-Management Relations Act in 1969 permit employer contributions to trust funds to establish child care centers for preschool and school-age dependents of employees. (Thus, such contributions can become an object of collective bargaining.) Subsequently, several companies appear to be considering or setting up day care projects. And two Boston firms, AVCO and KLH, have initiated programs. Amendments to the Social Security Act in 1967 called for establishment of day care centers for children of mothers who cannot qualify for welfare payments unless they have a job or obtain job training.

The Federal Focus

In spite of these significant beginnings and much discussion of the general importance of early childhood education, federal programs have been aimed primarily at assisting young children in special circumstances who might otherwise be expected to face future problems —generally the children of the poor—and reducing the welfare rolls by allowing women with young children to be trained, get and hold jobs. Indeed, total federal funding for early childhood education declined from $416 million in 1969 to $408 million in 1970. It should be noted, however, that Head Start funding, although originally slated for a ten percent reduction this year, was boosted to an all-time high of $360 million for FY 1971.

There is some evidence that renewed efforts are being made to put substance in federal efforts to promote early childhood programs. In the past, pressing needs in other areas—particularly higher education—absorbed a substantial proportion of federal funds. But new federal interest in early childhood programs is becoming evident.

In establishing priorities for research and development in education, the U.S. Office of Education in 1970 listed the following areas as receiving first attention: (1) reading; (2) early childhood; (3) vocational education; (4) school organization and administration; and (5) higher education. President Nixon has reaffirmed the federal government's commitment to early childhood, but the trend suggested in the Administration's Family Assistance Program (which passed the House

but was defeated in the Senate Committee) would relate day care to welfare programs.

Coordinating Federal Efforts

As in other areas, federal programs have often complicated state efforts to provide coordinated early childhood services. In fact, since 1965 when the Head Start program began, the proliferation of federally funded programs has been almost overwhelming. A guide to *Federal Programs for Young Children,* published in October 1970 by the Appalachian Regional Commission, lists no fewer than 310 federally funded early childhood programs (including child care and education; health, medical and welfare services; individual grants; training programs; food and nutrition; facilities and equipment; research and demonstration programs; and information and technical assistance). The same source lists 18 different federal agencies which administer these programs (Agriculture; American Printing House for the Blind; Commerce; Office of Economic Opportunity; Federal Housing Administration; Government Printing Office; Health, Education and Welfare; Housing and Urban Development; Intergovernmental Relations; Interior; Justice; Library of Congress; National Endowment for the Arts; National Science Foundation; President's Committee on Mental Retardation; Small Business Administration; Smithsonian Institution; and Veterans Administration).

The duplication, overlapping and rivalry evident at the federal level are often reflected and compounded in the states. Head Start grants, for example, go directly from HEW's Office of Child Development to local community action agencies or other public and private nonprofit agencies. Coordination of Head Start programs with efforts funded and administered by state agencies is greatly complicated.

An important premise of this report is that states must develop administrative structures to coordinate their early childhood efforts. Simultaneous action must be taken to coordinate federal administration of programs for young children. Of course, program operation should not be interrupted while the coordinating efforts are undertaken.

For a summary of pending federal legislation, see Appendix B.

Conflicting emphases are evident in Congress, but several bills would initiate coordination of federal programs for young children.

None of these bills, however, includes significant provisions for state level planning and coordination of early childhood programs.

Implications for the States

No matter what happens during the 92nd Congress, it is clear that the states will be left with major problems of developing and implementing statewide, coordinated and comprehensive programs. Although the federal government may make renewed efforts to consolidate its major research and operational activities, it is doubtful that the states will be much affected. And even if the major legislation proposed enjoys favorable action, there is little evidence that substantial financial support can be expected.

The most obvious lesson to be learned from previous and proposed federal activity in early childhood education is that—although new directions and priorities may be suggested and though there may be some seed money or special programs for special groups, particularly the disadvantaged—it will be up to the states to carry the major burden of their programs. In addition, the states will have to assume the responsibility of coordinating their own efforts with the many ongoing, federally supported programs.

It will be increasingly important for states to include in their own legislation provisions that encourage local districts and agencies to avoid program duplication resulting from federal funding patterns. In Florida, for example, legislation to be proposed in 1971 would provide incentive grants to districts which have made maximum use of all available federal funds.

This report is addressed to the question of the appropriate state action to be taken to implement early childhood programs. Perhaps the first action is to support federal legislation that would centralize federal programs and would give the states the authority to coordinate all of the activities under the various federal programs that are related to young children. Legislation should provide the funds that would make such coordination possible and require the states to survey the resources and needs within the state to develop a comprehensive program. Furthermore, legislation should request the states to establish a plan and priorities in early childhood development and submit a report to the federal government. Such reports from the states could provide the federal government with guidelines for future legislation. There are indications that such requirements will be enacted in 1971. Forward-thinking states would include central planning provisions in their early childhood programs in order to maximize federal funding.

organizational structure at the state level

How early childhood programs are administered at the state level will substantially affect the impact and nature of the state effort. And one thing is clear. Coordination of state programs must be drastically improved. Continued efforts must be made to eliminate the duplication caused by overlapping funding procedures. Both program centralization at the federal level and a means of channeling funds and effecting planning through a central state agency are needed. Federal and state legislation should be enacted to establish coordinating machinery for early childhood programs.

A centralized state approach and the development of a comprehensive state plan should help make maximum use of federal funding sources which often go underutilized because of the categorical, disjointed funding process resulting from varying statutes and regulations. A program for coordinated state planning would anticipate proposed national legislation. The Appalachian Regional Commission, for example, now requires that a state interagency committee be designated to approve, supervise and/or carry out planning for comprehensive services to young children. The interagency committee integrates planning, sets priorities and may also set program standards.

Existing Patterns of Administration

Present administrative patterns vary widely. In many state departments of education, an early childhood specialist in the division of elementary education is responsible for promoting and overseeing department programs and for effecting an informal liaison with programs run by other state agencies, the federal government and occasionally with private efforts.

State departments of social services, usually through the division

of public welfare, are generally responsible for licensing preschools and day care programs—excluding Head Start. They sometimes also administer day care programs for working mothers funded under Title IV of the Social Security Act of 1962. Head Start programs, which are funded by the federal government directly to local, public and private agencies, are administered by the regional HEW Offices of Child Development, though technical assistance is often provided with OEO funds through the governor's office at the state level. State departments of health often fund and administer special programs for the handicapped and immunization, vaccination and corrective treatment programs for health problems which might handicap children educationally. In addition, in some states, there are preschools administered directly by local school districts and supported by either local or federal (primarily Title I, ESEA) funds.

In some states, special efforts have been made to bring about a formalized coordination structure. Arkansas, for example, has a Governor's Council on Early Childhood Development formed to coordinate early childhood programs and services in the state as well as to design proposals for executive or legislative action and to educate the public about the field.

In other cases, state coordination is beginning to be effected through the federal Community Coordinated Child Care Program (4-C), which is administered under HEW's Office of Child Development. The 4-C program is a mechanism to coordinate programs of existing agencies providing day care and preschool services as well as other child and family services. Without a statutory base, however, it often lacks the impact necessary to achieve meaningful coordination.

Eight states (New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Ohio, Nebraska, Arkansas, Colorado and Oregon) and 13 communities are now conducting pilot 4-C programs. In Massachusetts, for example, the Governor's Advisory Committee on Child Development includes representatives of 13 state agencies, 12 service agencies and professional groups and 12 parents. The committee sets standards and makes long-range plans for day care and is the state's agency for the 4-C program. In other states the structure is less formal. The Colorado 4-C coordinator is an early childhood specialist affiliated with the state department of social services who works on a part-time basis to develop a network of communication and cooperation among the state's preschool and kindergarten programs. In addition to the 21 pilots, there are approximately 500 or more other communities and states that have begun developing 4-C organizations to plan and coordinate children's services to meet local needs.

Coordination where it exists is advisory and still only in the developmental stages. Fragmentation of the efforts of the numerous agencies in the field is widespread. And the growing significance of early childhood programs has not been reflected in state departments of education or in other state administrative agencies.

But if states are to assume a substantial responsibility for effective statewide educational programs for children before first grade, careful consideration must be given to the administrative structure to be utilized. There will inevitably be widespread growth—often in unconventional directions for which traditional administrative mechanisms are not always appropriate. Obviously, the placement of the overall responsibility for early childhood programs in one or another agency will influence the nature of the state's program. The alternative structures outlined below should be considered in terms of the suggested program implications as well as their feasibility within the framework of the state's current operations. Future-oriented planning is particularly important now.

Functions of a State Administering Agency

Any agency assigned or created to assume general responsibility for the administration of state early childhood programs should have at least the following functions:

a. To supervise or coordinate all state and federal funds for early childhood programs;
b. To analyze, make recommendations about and coordinate all state and federally funded programs for the development of early childhood personnel;
c. To develop a master plan for early childhood programs, staff and funding across the state;
d. To analyze and develop recommendations for state certification efforts related to early childhood personnel;
e. To develop a system of early diagnosis of children's needs and of meeting them.
f. To develop a system of parental training and for parental involvement in their children's education;
g. To make recommendations regarding state standards for private, particularly franchised, early childhood programs.
h. To serve as an advocate and promoter of programs to meet the needs of all young children in the state and to stimulate the development of postsecondary and inservice training programs for early childhood personnel.

Structures to Be Considered

Alternative 1

The establishment of a division of early childhood development within an existing state agency, such as the state department of education or health or welfare. A division head should be assigned with sufficient rank and responsibility to be of influence within the department.

If such a division were established in the department of education, it would be responsible for development and administration of programs for children through the age of five. At present, state departments of education generally are comprised of separate divisions, headed by a deputy commissioner, for elementary education (first through eighth or ninth grades) and for secondary education (the high school years). More significant and effective program development would result if current responsibilities were reorganized so that separate divisions were created for (1) early childhood programs defined as those for children through the age of nine (third grade); (2) intermediate programs for grades four through eight or nine; and (3) secondary programs for grades nine or ten through 12.

Such a reorganization would facilitate articulation between preprimary and first, second and third grade programs.

The division would have responsibility for administering those programs funded by the state and coordinating with federal and other programs administered through other state agencies. If a state, for example, were to provide an educational component for children at day care centers, the division of early childhood education would assume direct responsibility for the educational program and for coordinating it with the ongoing day care effort. Similar coordination with day care programs sponsored by industry for employees' children should be within the province of the division also.

It is important that the division be established at a level of recognized responsibility. The prevalent pattern, by which early childhood programs are administered by staff without the influence and stature to effect innovative concepts and coordinate the innumerable programs administered by various agencies, has been generally ineffective and should not be duplicated.

Benefits and drawbacks Placing responsibility for early childhood programs in a newly created division of the state department of education would insure utilization of the experience and familiarity of a traditional structure and would maximize the emphasis on the educational aspects of programs for

very young children. By retaining responsibility for these programs within the same framework administering elementary and secondary schools, the set-up should enable the school system to facilitate the transition between early childhood programs and the standardized first, second and third grades. At the same time, such a structure might make it more difficult to develop innovative kindergarten and pre-kindergarten programs. The tendency to extend current school patterns back down to younger children would be great.

But emphasizing the educational aspects of the program under these circumstances might be more of a drawback than a benefit to a coordinated day care program. In fact, a necessary condition would have to be that the state department's personnel would have to think in terms of the development of the child, not just the child's education. Even under these circumstances, it may be difficult to obtain the cooperation and support of other state agencies who have a stake in the program.

If either the department of health or welfare were designated as the state agency for administering the early childhood education program, internal reorganization there such as we suggest in education would be necessary to give the program a prominent place in that department.

The benefits seem to be fewer and the drawbacks greater with either health or welfare but, of course, that depends on the state's structure and current organizational pattern. In Florida, for example, legislation is being proposed which would place responsibility for early childhood programs in the welfare department because of that agency's proven record in the field.

Alternative 2

The establishment of an office of child development as an independent state agency, headed by a commissioner of child development appointed by the governor. The office would administer all programs in the state for children up to the age of six. A special advisory board should be established composed of the heads of the departments of health, mental health, welfare, social security, education, vocational education and junior colleges, higher education and the chairmen of the legislative education committees and representatives of private early childhood programs. In addition, a special consulting committee comprised of pediatricians and child psychiatrists and psychologists should be appointed by the governor to advise the office of child development on special programs.

This approach is being recommended on a preliminary basis by

the Massachusetts Early Education Project, conducted by Harvard University. The project suggests the creation of a department for children to consolidate the state's role in early education and child care. Its primary functions would be providing consultation, technical assistance and advice at the local level to facilitate establishment and maintenance of quality child care services; licensing, research and evaluation, planning and coordination. The department would have an advisory council, in conformity with the Community Coordinated Child Care (4-C) concept, comprised of parents, providers of service (public and private), child development experts and representatives of agencies involved in children's services. The department would have a working budget that emphasizes provision of technical assistance and consultation to local communities to foster the growth of needed child care services. The bulk of the services would be locally arranged and either without cost or paid for by the family and the local community. A proposed budget for the office—including 46 central and regional professional personnel, 20 central and regional nonprofessional personnel, maintenance of one central and eight regional offices, and program support—totals $1.2 million.

Benefits and drawbacks The establishment of an office of child development at the state level offers a new approach stressing overall state-level coordination and heightened prestige for the early years. Concentration on the development and implementation of innovative programs and staffing patterns, including particularly early diagnosis and parental involvement, would be more feasible than within any of the traditional administrative structures. Similarly, the development of new funding patterns should be facilitiated. It might be possible, for example, to establish a general fund including all moneys expended by the state for early childhood programs (education, health, welfare, etc.) which would then be allocated to the office of child development for distribution to various programs. Centralized coordination would be greatly enhanced.

The imposition of such a superstructure might add to the problems of red tape already evident in coordination. It should be very clear that a new level of bureaucracy is not just being superimposed on existing problems. And there is some danger that intensive centralization of authority would limit local initiative and participation. The need for new efforts to avoid program and administrative duplication are so great, however, that with proper safeguards for variety it does not seem probable that such an organizational pattern would lead to excessive central control.

Alternative 3

The establishment of a state child care coordinating council in the governor's office. The governor would appoint the council and delegate authority to it. The membership would consist of parents (at least one-third of the total membership), representatives of public agencies having an interest in child development programs (such as the board of education, the department of public welfare, etc.), and representatives of private groups having an interest in children's services (such as professional organizations and education institutions).

The council would be responsible for planning child development services on a statewide basis. It would also be responsible for coordinating all state services for children; members of the council, while retaining responsibility for their individual programs, would agree to coordinate and administer those programs and allocate resources on the basis of the state plan. Finally, the council would be responsible for evaluation of children's services.

One approach to such a council was adopted in West Virginia in April 1971. Governor Arch Moore, by executive order, created an Interagency Council for Child Development Services and delineated its structure, powers and duties. The Council, composed of the heads of state agencies with early childhood concerns, will develop and maintain a comprehensive plan for the provision of child development services in the state, allocate and evaluate the functions of council member agencies, determine priorities and make recommendations for legislation. Governor Moore appointed himself chairman of the council.

Benefits and drawbacks Such an approach would facilitate overall state planning and coordination through the central administration of various program funds. Placing the council in the governor's office would give it the authority to implement substantive innovation in program content and delivery mechanisms. Such an approach would also minimize the dangers of adding to red tape, as the council, being composed of representatives of groups already operating children's programs, would not represent a new layer of bureaucracy. Finally, the participation of consumers (parents) as voting members, not simply advisors, will alleviate the dangers of intensive centralization. Some inconsistency might result from changes related to the political and changing nature of the governorship.

alternative state program approaches

The type of program a state chooses and where it sets its initial priorities within the many early childhood education program alternatives must be carefully considered in light of overall state needs and resources. A state may combine several approaches to meet the various needs of its young children and their families. The most difficult decisions will involve where to begin, how to best use available resources, and how best to plan program expansion to meet the general need.

The recommendations and alternatives suggested for state action are based upon four assumptions:

1. The state has a responsibility to the total population.
2. The state must develop some equitable basis for the allocation of funds.
3. A state program should take into consideration the possible participation by several agencies in the funding of programs.
4. A state will probably have to phase in the program over a number of years.

ALTERNATIVE STATE PROGRAM

The following table has been compiled to highlight the major
might consider in developing early childhood programs

Target Orientation	*Program*	*Objectives*
Education for parents of children younger than three, based on demonstration centers.	Comprehensive health and developmental training for expectant and new parents.	To prevent most severe health and educationally related handicaps by early parent training and diagnosis to help families do a better job of rearing their children.
Reaching the child in his home.	Classroom training of parents to work with their own children; e.g., toy library.	Even with limited training program, large numbers of parents can be helped to enhance the early development of all youngsters in the family.
	TV training of parents to work with children.	Through parent-oriented programs, probably in conjunction with a child's series; programs to train parents to work with their own children.
	Parent training including a home visit by a professional.	To monitor and assist parent participation in child's development through visit by qualified professional teacher or aide to work with parents and children in the home situation.
	TV programs for children.	To supplement parent and other child development efforts by providing entertaining TV fare.
Combined approach—reaching child in home and group experience.	Parent training, home visit plus limited classroom experience for children. TV as instructional aid.	Parent involvement in child's development at home is supplemented by TV assistance. Children also benefit in social growth by sharing and working together in a group. The combined approach offers added possibility of identifying youngsters or families which need special help because of mental or physical handicaps.
Providing group experiences for young children.	Support and extend Head Start programs.	Extend proven benefits of Head Start programs to more children building on existing administrative and facilities resources.

APPROACHES A SUMMARY

features of the several alternative approaches which states and which are discussed more fully in this section.

Funding Methods/Costs	*Evaluation*
State could operate demonstration child care centers or license, supervise and subsidize locally or privately run centers. A diagnostic center could operate for $25 per child.	A creative and innovative program for children from 0-3 or 4, according to some experts, offers the greatest benefits by preventing later health and educational problems.
Costs can be as low as $100 per family.	Has proven effective on limited scale. Problem of no follow-up and little chance of diagnosing difficulties unless family returns to program for help.
Average cost of a proposed program in the Southwest for bilingual families is 50 cents per family per year.	Model program has not yet been developed. Might be difficult to reach groups with greatest need. Potential is believed to be great.
$200-$300 per child, as indicated by experimental program at the University of Illinois, Urbana.	Initial results of demonstration program encouraging. Home visit encourages parents, maintains progress and is useful in diagnosing and solving problems.
Initial cost, as indicated by Sesame Street, may be as low as $1 a year per child. Tapes can be bought by states for reuse as desired.	Initial year's program of Sesame Street effectively increased viewers' learning. May be difficult to reach children with greatest need.
$235 per child as indicated by model program developed by Appalachia Educational Laboratory.	Appalachia program has been successful in using paraprofessionals and in rural areas. Could be applied in urban situation. Combined approach offers significant developmental benefits.
Average cost is $1050 per child. Substantial savings if administration of ongoing and new programs could be consolidated.	The advantages of a Head Start type program in meeting special needs, using specially trained but not all certified staff and community facilities could be extended to a high-quality state program.

ALTERNATIVE STATE PROGRAM

Target Orientation	*Program*	*Objectives*
Providing group experiences for young children (cont'd)	Subsidization of private programs for selected children.	To aid children most in need through existing programs especially when no, or insufficient, public programs exist.
	Day Care, with planned and developmental experiences explicitly provided.	To encourage provision of day care services for working parents and to enhance the program with planned developmental experiences, state to support an educational component or full-time professional staff.
	TV in a classroom situation.	To supplement classroom efforts with innovative programming; could be basis for expanded program.
Preschools	Classroom training for 3- and 4-year-olds.	To provide classroom programs for younger children.
Kindergarten	Classroom programs 3-3½ hours per day, 5 days a week.	To provide a classroom program for five-year-olds.
Accreditation of private programs.	Regulating standards of private preschools and kindergartens, especially those established by franchising.	To insure state surveillance over physical facilities, staff qualifications and minimal program standards; flexibility is essential.

APPROACHES A SUMMARY — *(Continued)*

Funding Methods/Costs	*Evaluation*
A voucher to be provided to each child to be redeemed in educational services. Value could be determined according to need and state resources. State might consider establishing loan fund to assist in expansion of facilities.	Would enable state to offer support for preprimary programs with a classroom emphasis without major outlay of funds for facilities and personnel.
State encouragement of federal and private funding of overall day care program; e.g., state matching funds for federal grants under Title IV, Social Security Act and Tax incentives for industrial programs for employees. Cost would be about $1500 per pupil or less if limited educational component provided.	Would help meet growing need for day care while enhancing the development of children of working parents who might be among those with great need for such a program. Should probably be part of every state's early childhood effort.
Some savings in materials with a concomitant increase in quality should be realized.	Will be increasingly important as communications technology advances (e.g.: NASA plans for communications satellite available for educational programming).
At least five states provide funds for preschools usually through special demonstration grants. Per pupil allocations range from $200 to $780 per year.	Although preschools offer social and developmental experiences, they are expensive and other alternatives may be as effective and involve parents more. State support for establishing formal preschools should be a limited part of a comprehensive program.
Kindergartens are now operated in at least 38 states and funded usually through the foundation program in 28. State support ranges from $17 to $900 per pupil. This does not include provisions for comprehensive services.	If kindergarten not yet established, children would be best and most economically served by a combination of the alternatives outlined, probably including some kindergarten-type programs especially for the handicapped and those with learning disabilities.
	All states should probably initiate efforts to insure minimum standards in private programs.

PART 1. A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH INCLUDING CHILDREN YOUNGER THAN THREE

It would be a disservice to states concerned about the development of young children to leave the impression that there is agreement that a combination of programs for three- to five-year-olds is the best approach. It is an assumption of this report that legislative demands for measurable standards and the understandable tendency to provide services for youngsters not yet served by the public schools in descending age groups will mean that—to be adopted—programs should focus on fives, fours and threes.

In fact, however, many experts argue that the most effective approach—and therefore in the long run the most economical—should focus on the health and welfare of expectant mothers and the upbringing of the infant child. The assumption is that if prenatal health problems were prevented, postnatal difficulties diagnosed and treated, and very early development properly directed, many fewer children would need special programs. And those who did could be better assisted by special attention before the age of three.

There is strong support for the recommendation that a forward-thinking, innovative state should develop a comprehensive program focused on prospective parents and children in the first few years of life.

Whether or not states develop programs for three-, four- and five-year-olds, it might be desirable to start with a program for parents with children under three because:

(1) After the initial expense of developing such a program, the cost would be relatively low;

(2) The ability to make early diagnoses and provide early remediation where needed would strengthen programs for the threes, fours and fives; and

(3) Some day care services for mothers of children under three are essential regardless of the decision about where to focus other state efforts. In light of this fact, it would be unfortunate to miss the opportunity to make these services as effective as possible.

Such programs should probably start no later than when an expectant mother knows she is pregnant. They could start sooner; for example, in high school courses for boys and girls that help them understand how human beings grow and develop. Such courses should include some experience of working with young children in day care or Head Start centers or in the early elementary grades.

It is crucial that expectant parents learn about the needs for an adequate diet and other health needs during pregnancy and how to care for an infant. They should also know what to expect during the first few weeks of the infant's life. After the child is born, the mother and father need a constant source of information on how the child develops and how to aid in that development. One way to provide this kind of assistance is through adult education courses, but such courses without additional input will only reach the better informed and most interested parents—the ones who are least likely to need the information.

As long as a child is receiving an adequate diet and living in a healthy, stimulating environment there is little need for concern about his development and intellectual growth. An organization that might help define health and a stimulating environment would be a child care center. There young parents could see films, borrow books and consult counselors on the development of infants and young children. They could also borrow games and toys accompanied by information on ways in which these could be used to help their children grow. The center would provide diagnostic services for examination of young children to discover any problems that might exist such as hearing, or visual difficulties, or learning disabilities of different kinds. The center could either have the services available to correct the problems and assist parents in coping with them or refer parents to other agencies that could help.

For some very young children, there will be a need to provide day care services because (1) the child is not in a healthy environment or (2) the parents need the service. The determination of need based upon the child's requirements could be made by the diagnostic team in the center and the participation would be voluntary on the part of the parents. In any event such service is expensive—probably in excess of $1,500 per year for all day care and should be on a fee basis, according to the parents' ability to pay.

The state could choose to operate such day care centers, delegate a local agency to operate them, or license, supervise, and subsidize privately operated centers.

PART 2. ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS FOR THREES, FOURS AND FIVES

There is no evidence that all three-, four- and five-year-old children will benefit from a three-hour or longer formalized group experience in a nursery school, Head Start or kindergarten. But there is considerable evidence that all children need an intellectually stimulating environment during these years when they are developing at a rapid rate.

Child in the Home Programs

An effective course of action would be to provide help to parents so that they can aid their young child in developing. This is the least expensive way to reach the greatest number; it tends to strengthen the family; it develops the competence of the parents; and it probably contributes as much or more to the child's intellectual development as a three-hour classroom program.

a. ***Classroom training of parents to work with their children.*** Several programs could be developed which depend upon limited training of parents to work with their own children. Training can be provided through evening courses in school facilities or other locations.

One example is a parent/child toy-lending library program where the parents meet once a week for eight weeks. They learn general principles about child growth and development and how to help their children develop language ability. They see demonstrations of how to use a game or toy or puzzle to help a child develop a skill, learn a concept or solve a problem. After seeing the demonstration, the parents practice using the game and then take it home and try it with their own children. After they finish the course, they can borrow toys and games from the library as often as they wish. Such a program has the advantage of not requiring a classroom and of enabling a teacher, who normally reaches 15 to 20 children a year, to reach more than 100 parents a year. The estimated cost is about $100 per parent.

This program could be supplemented while a mother is still in the hospital with movies about approaches important both to the newborn and older children in the family. Such efforts have proven extremely effective on a limited scale, though there is the problem of no follow-up and little chance of diagnosing problem situations unless the family returns to the program subsequently for help.

b. ***TV training of parents to work with children.*** The use of television to reach parents and to train them to work with their children has great potential. A creative state could develop its own parent-oriented program building on Sesame Street, perhaps in conjunction with the Children's Television Workshop. Or an entirely new program based on a parent participation concept might be tried. The Federation of Rocky Mountain States is proposing two companion bilingual programs in the Southwest, one for bilingual children and one for their parents. Average cost per family is estimated to be about 50 cents per year.

c. ***Parent training including a home visit.*** Either of the above-mentioned approaches could be rendered more effective—at relatively little additional cost—by adding a home visit by a qualified professional teacher or aide who would work with both parents and children in the home situation.

An experimental tutorial program at the University of Illinois in Urbana demonstrates this possibility. The program focuses on children between the ages of one and four who live in deprived areas. Mothers conduct daily sessions at home with their children and also attend a two-hour group meeting once a week with professional staff at a local preschool. To check on the progress of mother and child and to help solve any problems, staff members make home visits once a month or more often as needed.

The results of the program with the initial group of 20 mothers have been encouraging to educational researchers. It is estimated that the cost of duplicating the program, which is now funded as an Office of Economic Opportunity research demonstration project, would total $200 to $300 per child. This would include salaries of one trained professional and two teacher aides for each 20 children; funds for transportation to group meetings; and costs of materials.

d. ***Television programs for children.*** The development of special television programs for children offers important early educational opportunities, as Sesame Street has proven. States should not expect Sesame Street to discharge their early childhood responsibilities; it cannot by itself. But it can serve as a principle agent for children whose parents build on it. States should encourage parents to utilize the experience. For children without this support, it can at least supplement other educational programs. The initial cost per child may be as low as $1.00. Tapes can be bought by the states for reuse as desired. An evaluation of the first year of Sesame Street, conducted by the Educational Testing Service, indicated that the learning

of viewing children has been effectively increased but that the greatest gains resulted when families enhanced the television experience. Thus to some extent it has been difficult to reach children with the greatest need.

Combined Group Education, Television and Home Visit Program

Another technique would be to combine working with the parents and limited classroom experience or special service. A combined approach, which provides a classroom experience in addition to a home visit program and uses television as an instructional aid, offers extended benefits, including parent involvement in education at home but also social growth by giving children practice in sharing and working together in a group.

A model effort is being implemented by the Appalachia Educational Laboratory. A specially designed mobile classroom van, driven and staffed by a teacher and an aide, offers children a weekly group experience. Classes are held for 15 children for two-hour sessions. A special television program is shown for a half-hour each weekday during the school year. Teachers' aides make weekly home visits, for 30 to 45 minutes, to work with the mother and child, building on the television series and using additional materials. The home visitors, who range in age from 18 to 63 and have at least a high school diploma or the equivalent, receive three weeks of preservice training and an afternoon of inservice training every two weeks. It is estimated that the program could be provided to all three-, four- and five-year-olds in the State of West Virginia at an annual cost of $235 per child. Establishing standard kindergarten classes for the same children would cost $496 per child per year.

Although the Appalachian program has been aimed to serve children in rural, sparsely populated areas, it could be used successfully in urban and suburban areas. The use of a mobile classroom would alleviate problems of finding or constructing standard facilities.

This approach could be made particularly effective during a course for parents or the home visit by a professional or aide. Those children and parents needing special help because of physical and mental handicaps could be identified and provided the additional help required. For example, a child with a special speech problem might come to a center for help three times a week but a child who is visually handicapped might spend three hours a day receiving special assistance.

Group Programs for Threes, Fours and Fives

A third alternative would be to provide different kinds of group experiences for young children. The previously discussed alternatives for three-, four- and five-year-old children are relatively inexpensive and could probably be undertaken by most states without any major shift in priorities. But providing facilities and teachers for large numbers of children to receive group care becomes expensive and does force a state to consider priorities.

Some programs for young children in a group situation—other than standard kindergarten and preschool—can be provided, however, by building on programs that already exist. There is a financial advantage to such efforts—because the start-up and facilities costs would be reduced.

a. ***Educational experience in a day care program.*** Day care services are needed in increasing numbers to service families who have no choice but to leave a young child in someone's care while they work or study. Day care comes in different forms: day care centers and day care at home for four or five children. Day care centers can be privately or publicly operated or supported by industry. A day care "home" provides as teachers adults who have the same culture and life style as the parents and keeps the child in a more home-like and less institutionalized setting. Though such homes currently have a poor record of performance, this problem is primarily a matter of training, regulation and supervision. An experimental program in New York City has demonstrated that such a setting can offer high-quality day care service and provide employment for some mothers. State requirements for such homes would have to be revised, training provided and some realistic system of supervision established. The homes should be related to a larger day care center which can provide comprehensive services that are needed to make the day care homes work.

Unlike kindergarten, which lasts three or four hours a day for nine months, day care lasts all day long every working day of the year. This time element makes a fundamental difference to the children and to the adults who teach and work in day care centers. And a day care program serves a wide age range of children—from infants to nine- to twelve-year-old children (in an after-school program), providing opportunities for younger and older children to associate with each other—an arrangement that offers many beneficial learning opportunities.

There are substantial and increasing federal and private—particularly industry—funds available for day care programs. But facilities are not yet adequate to the demand.

State participation in day care programs would be most effective if it included two simultaneous efforts:

(1) encouragement of expanded federal and privately funded programs,
   —by providing state matching funds for federal grants such as those available under Title IV of the Social Security Act and being contemplated under the Family Assistance Program and
   —offering incentives to industries to establish day care programs for their employees' children; and

(2) provision of state support for an educational component in an ongoing day care program. Teachers, teachers' aides and materials could be provided in day care centers for limited sessions, perhaps two hours a day several times a week, with state funding. A primary purpose of the program would be to involve the regular day care staff in the educational program so that they could themselves assist in the intellectual development of the children and perhaps serve as teachers' aides. After-hours and weekend programs could be developed to involve parents and then train them to supplement the program at home. The cost of providing such an educational component would be less than supporting a full-time educational program with a certified teaching staff. Such a circumscribed approach would not, however, give the state as much leverage in coordinating day care programs and regulating the maintenance of minimum standards.

The costs of including professional educators on the full-time staff of a day care program are suggested by two nursery school centers in Santa Monica, California. These state-supported but locally administered centers provide quality day care facilities with learning activities at low cost to working mothers and other needy families. Each school enrolls 37 children and employs five teachers, a cook, housekeeper and part-time nurse. Both are located near junior high schools and serve as laboratory schools for eighth and ninth graders interested in child development. The centers are supported by state funds and parents' fees, supplemented in some districts by a local tax. The state contributes an average of 52 cents per hour per child, or three-fourths of the cost of the program. Parent fees, which are deter-

mined on a sliding scale, cover the remaining one-fourth of the cost and average 16 cents per hour per child. The cost of the program, which averaged $1,274 per pupil annually, is justified on the basis that the availability of the centers enables many families to be self-supporting who would otherwise have to depend on more costly forms of public assistance.

Such an effort could be provided in day care centers supported by federal, state, local or private funds, in child care programs run by industry for employees' children, or even in day care homes for small groups of children. In the latter instance, it would be necessary to establish special training programs for the licensed operator who would be assisted by periodic visits from a professional teacher or teacher aide. State funds should be provided for specially selected equipment which would be available on a loan basis. For example, a compact "store-under-the-bed" version of the toy library might be very useful.

b. ***Support and extend Head Start programs.*** Head Start usually provides a three-hour program for three- and four-year-old children; but in districts that do not have kindergartens, Head Start includes five-year-olds. As in kindergarten, the major focus is on educational programs in the classroom for 15 to 20 children. Head Start provides additional health and social services for children and their parents and encourages the parents to participate in the classroom as paid assistants or volunteers and to become involved in the decision-making process. Day care programs can also be supported by Head Start to provide educational, health, social service and parent participation components.

Head Start programs are not necessarily part of the public school system. In many instances, Head Start is operated by the public schools, but in other instances it is operated by social welfare agencies, churches and community action groups.

Even when Head Start is operated by the school district, the project usually has a special status and is not considered an integral part of the school program. This administrative arrangement has been beneficial to the innovational development of Head Start programs and has allowed them to experiment with the use of teacher aides or assistants and involve more parents in the decision-making process.

One of the problems, however, is that Head Start programs often lack the necessary administrative support structure to insure their continuity. They have difficulties obtaining adequate physical facil-

ities; they are not able to weather a temporary reduction in funds or a delay in funding; and they are subject to political and administrative problems that arise over the funding and administration of community action groups.

Yet Head Start programs have been very effective in meeting the needs of disadvantaged youngsters. The cost has been high, owing to the medical and dental services needed by many of the youngsters served.

An effective state program could be developed by expanding the existing Head Start effort to more five-, four- and three-year-olds. The same methods and assumptions should apply: nonschool facilities like church basements and storefronts could be used; teachers and teachers' assistants could be specially trained and employed without meeting standard elementary certification requirements. If the full health services now considered part of Head Start were made integral to a state program, the effort would be significant in solving many of the education-related problems holding back not only disadvantaged but young children of all economic levels. Such services are, of course, expensive. Costs of Head Start range from $870 per pupil in South

Carolina to $2,800 for the same kind of program in Boston. The average cost is about $1,050 per child per year.

It would be possible to provide similar services in conjunction with a Head Start-like program at less cost. Legislation to be proposed in Florida in 1971, for example, would require that every three-year-old have medical tests for diseases and problems that might be considered educational handicaps. Most parents would be expected to pay for such examinations, but presumably state funds would be available if the family could not afford them.

An elaborate mechanism for the administration of Head Start already exists at the federal, regional and local levels. If the states were to become involved, careful steps should be taken to avoid administrative duplication and to reduce ever-rising administrative costs. In Denver there are seven different agencies designated to administer Head Start programs. If administration of these programs could be consolidated, substantial savings could be effected and many more children served. It has been estimated that, if Head Start funds could be administered by the state in South Carolina, at least 40,000 more children could be served.

Such consolidation could be accomplished without new federal or state legislation. It would be necessary for the Office of Economic Opportunity, which funds Head Start, to designate the state department of education or another state agency as the administering agency. The state agency would then be responsible for central administration. Although fears have been expressed that placing responsibility at the state level would limit Head Start's flexibility and parental involvement, any administering agency would be subject to the regulations now guiding local agencies.

Another approach used in Tacoma, Washington, provides a comprehensive program for more than 600 three- to nine-year-olds by using funds from Head Start, Follow Through, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and other state and local sources. Program components include day care centers, preschool classes, kindergarten classes, first-grade classes and a primary enrichment program. Program costs average about $1,600 per child, about $900 over the base district cost of $700 per child. This cost includes the nutritional program, the cost for aides and staff training, and transportation of children to the centers.

c. ***Subsidize private programs for selected children.*** The state might provide aid to children to attend existing private preschool and/or kindergarten programs. If enough spaces were not available

at the outset, initial selection might be based on whether a child is determined to be "disadvantaged," his age (beginning with one age group); where he lives (in relation to the availability of private programs); a lottery system; or some other method.

The system could work like a voucher program. A child's family would be given a certain sum (higher if the family were below a certain economic level) which would be used at existing private preschools and/or kindergartens. Needless to say, careful planning would be necessary to insure that adequate space existed. A state might consider establishing a loan fund for facility expansion during the early years.

In some states, constitutional provisions may prohibit such a scheme. And there has been widespread opposition to such a plan at the elementary-secondary level. In early childhood education, however, the purpose would not be to set up competitors to the public schools. It would be to provide opportunities for children unable to take advantage of private programs when no public programs exist.

d. ***TV in a group situation.*** Sesame Street, the revolutionary preschoolers series developed by the Children's Television Workshop, has excited far-reaching thoughts about widespread use of the program —or similar ones—for group education for young children. The program is not an alternative to other experiences, but a supplement that can become an integral part of them. Such innovative programming can be used in conjunction with and to augment a classroom effort, yielding significant savings and high quality, and it can be used in groups brought together for "class" in neighborhood homes, perhaps augmented by a "teacher" who visits each group once a week to assist and advise the group mother.

Careful consideration should be given to building use of a TV series like Sesame Street into the educational program. A day care, Head Start or even a classroom kindergarten program could make effective use of the medium. Programs could even be built primarily around the series—bringing children and teachers together for two hours or more to view the program together and then to expand upon it.

The producers of Sesame Street are setting up a wide variety of experimental programs which will be part of a broader experience for children and their parents. In Detroit, starting in February 1971, 25,000 four-year-old children are being encouraged to watch Sesame Street daily and attend classes on Saturday morning. This is the first phase of a four-phase program. The second phase is to provide

summer school for 25,000 children. The third phase is to provide half-day preschool classes for 9,200 children, and the fourth phase would offer a preschool program for 25,000 children. So the use of TV is the first step in initiating a complete preschool program for four-year-old children.

In fact, communications technology is moving so rapidly that television as an educational medium should probably be considered to supplement almost all early childhood programs. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) is planning to launch a communications satellite which would be available for educational programming and which would broadcast directly to modified home receivers. The larger the area—particularly if sparsely settled—the more likely it is that satellites will be cheaper than terrestrial microwave relay.

e. ***State-supported classroom preschools.*** Many private organizations, some communities and some states in pilot programs offer classroom preschool programs for three- and four-year-olds for two or three mornings a week. Offering early group experiences and some educational training, these programs have been very popular with families who have come to believe that more training—starting earlier—is better for their children.

In many instances, such programs—little versions of kindergartens—provide important early experience. They are, however, higher in cost than the other alternatives outlined here and do not usually involve parents actively in the education of their children.

In those states that do not have kindergarten, even the initiation of classroom programs for fours and fives only would mean adding two years to the existing 12-year system. If sufficient classrooms and teachers were added to the existing system to accommodate these children, it would require an expansion of about eight percent in facilities and about 17 percent in staff and funding. These estimates assume that two classes could be held in a room each day, but that at least two adults would be required in each room. In those states that have kindergarten the addition of one year for fours to the existing 13-year program would be more manageable. But it would still be a major expansion involving approximately five percent more in facilities and eight percent more in staffing and funding. Of course, the costs of also establishing similar programs for threes would be proportionately greater.

It is not recommended that states establish formal classroom programs for all three- and four-year-olds.

f. ***Insuring quality in on-going kindergarten programs.*** It is assumed that a state with an established public kindergarten program will continue to operate it. Although there is no evidence that formal classroom kindergartens are essential for all children, quality kindergarten programs certainly have desirable educational benefits that justify their continued support. The key is quality.

It is particularly important that states review and revitalize existing kindergarten programs with the following guidelines in mind:

a. Kindergarten should receive substantial state support equal to or exceeding state support for elementary classrooms.

b. Certification standards should be flexible with provisions for certifying assistant teachers who have had little or no formal college training.

c. Minimum standards for an instructional unit should be set. For example, an adult-child ratio of one to ten. For 30 children this might be one teacher and two assistants who might mothers of children in the program.

d. Special provision should be made to involve parents in the program.

e. Teachers should not be required to teach two sessions of kindergarten. If two sessions are necessary in the same room, the morning and afternoon sessions should be staffed by different teachers and assistants.

If reasonable standards cannot be set and maintained for kindergarten because of limited facilities or cost, a school district should look at other alternatives for serving five-year-old children and their parents.

If a state has not established kindergarten programs, it would be wise to consider the entire problem of providing for the development and education of all young children before undertaking the expensive proposition of providing facilities and teachers for its five-year-old children.

Accreditation of Private Programs

Whether or not a state has a formal state-supported kindergarten program, it is important that the state develop methods to regulate the standards of private kindergartens, particularly those established in the rapidly expanding franchising effort. There should be state surveillance over physical facilities, staff qualifications and minimal program standards. Of course, flexibility should be key.

priorities and methods for implementation

Whether a state determines to provide classroom instruction for all five-year-olds and support alternative programs for younger children or to offer a variety and combination of out-of-classroom programs for all pre-first graders, the problem of how to phase in program activities must be faced. It is assumed that even if a state chooses low cost parent/child programs, limitations of resources and staff will necessitate the establishment of initial priorities.

Concerted efforts should be made, as recommended elsewhere in this report, to secure the passage of federal legislation which would enable the states to coordinate federal programs in the state, to study the needs and resources of the entire state and to enable the state to establish comprehensive priorities. The states must continue to stress such a comprehensive approach. The intent should not be to delay action on program implementation but to underline the need for more coordination of effort.

1. ***Initial training of personnel.*** If a state is committed to the concept of early childhood education but is able to predict a lack of trained personnel for kindergarten and prekindergarten programs, it might adopt as its first priority the development of postsecondary and inservice programs for professional and other positions. Among the actions to be undertaken might be:

—a program of incentive grants to state colleges and universities to encourage them to include specialized graduate programs in their schools of education and undergraduate B.A. programs in early childhood education;

—a program of incentive grants to state junior and community colleges to provide courses in early childhood education;

—the development of programs for retraining—through formal efforts in two-year and four-year institutions and through in-service programs—credentialed elementary school teachers wanting kindergarten positions;

—the establishment of a limited number of model demonstration centers to provide inservice training for professional and para-professional personnel prior to the expansion of the state program.

It should be emphasized that this alternative of focusing first on staff development should not be undertaken without concurrent planning for the initiation of the state's early childhood program so that positions will be open as staff are prepared to fill them and so that funding commitments are made to the development of a full-scale program.

2. ***Early diagnosis.*** A state might focus first on the development of an early diagnosis system—and personnel to administer it—which would determine need for various alternative programs. To insure effectiveness of the alternative approaches suggested—to a greater or lesser degree—early diagnosis of a child's educational needs is basic. In many instances, the home situation with minimal professional guidance can prepare a child to enter a formal learning situation with adequate expectations of success. Of course, there will always be exceptions—because of particular family situations, physical or psychological handicaps, etc. If the special needs of such children are diagnosed early—at the latest by age three—and they can be directed to special programs, they can be guaranteed a reasonable chance of success. And the state can be saved substantial future costs.

Ideally, a comprehensive diagnosis system would not only identify those youngsters needing substantial help, but also those who need only minimal or no further preprimary assistance. By reducing the need to provide programs across the board for all children, such diagnosis would limit the "essential" state involvement.

Legislation proposed in New York for an Office of Child Development includes important provisions for development of professional personnel who would conduct early diagnosis programs. A bill has been introduced in the California Legislature to provide funds for such early diagnosis. The purposes of the proposed Educational Development Assessment Act are to reduce the incidence of students assigned to special education programs, cut down school failure due to undiagnosed, correctable learning disabilities and increase school personnel's knowledge of children's needs so that they can design more

satisfactory programs. The bill would provide state funds for up to 90 percent of the cost of such a program, but not to exceed $45 per student to be assessed.

3. ***Model demonstration centers.*** The state could consider establishing a limited number of model demonstration centers. But the time has passed when the major requirement is to provide models. The federal government, through the planned variation program in Head Start and the Follow Through program, provides a number of model demonstration centers across the country that can be studied by individuals interested in state programs.

The same arrangement has not been provided for day care, but the Office of Child Development and the Office of Economic Opportunity funded a major effort during the summer of 1970 to pull together all the information on experimental and demonstration programs that could be used as parts of an effective day care program. This effort will result in the publication of three or four books covering: day care for infants; day care for three-, four- and five-year-old children; after-school day care for older children, and training of day care personnel. In addition, the Office of Economic Opportunity is planning to fund a number of demonstration centers across the United States. These federal efforts should fill the need for model demonstration centers.

4. ***Meeting the needs of the disadvantaged first.*** Another approach to establishing a program would be to serve first the children with the greatest need. This priority would focus initial efforts on children from low-income homes, children of ethnic and minority groups and handicapped children. Such an approach has the advantage of providing a systematic way of introducing and expanding a program step-by-step as funding, trained personnel and facilities become available. It is also based upon a sound premise of starting where the need is greatest.

But there are these limitations. The states would then be duplicating or supplementing federal programs; the result might be to encourage the federal government to either maintain the current effort or reduce it. If the notion of shared responsibility is acceptable, however, it would follow that the federal government should be encouraged to expand its efforts rather than to reduce them. In any case, there should be funding articulation and coordination between state and federal sources.

There is a problem of making administrative decisions as to who

has the greatest need. The income-level approach, used by the federal government, is probably the easiest, yet it is difficult to administer because of the vast variations in what income means even within a state.

Income as a method of determining who will receive services also presents other problems. A family may initially qualify for services and later improve its economic position so that it no longer qualifies. In such a case, a minor advance in the family income could be undesirable because of a loss in services for their children. Income level, moreover, does not necessarily correspond to need. It is probably true that the highest percentage of children with the greatest need are from low-income homes, but many children from other homes are in equal need of services.

There is also a political consideration. The working man who is just above the poverty level is probably willing to support such a program if he sees that, before long, he too will benefit; but if it appears that someone else's children are going to keep getting a "head start" and his children are not, he is likely to oppose the program strongly.

5. ***Support for an educational component for older children at day care centers.*** The beginnings of a state program might be developed by first subsidizing an educational component at existing public, private and industrially established day care centers for four- or five-year-old children. Such an effort would reach the children of working mothers, a high proportion of whom it can be assumed would benefit greatly from a formalized educational program; would provide the basis for future expansion to all children; and would offer an opportunity for inservice staff training without the need to solve facilities problems at the start.

Additional factors favoring day care as the place to start are the great need for it, the substantial political support behind it, and the federal funds available to contribute to its support. The state would provide some assistance to existing centers to provide an educational component, encourage industry by offering some assistance, and supplement the efforts of the federal government to establish new centers.

One of the basic considerations should be to assist day care homes to obtain a license and upgrade the quality of the service to children. Most of the children who are currently receiving day care services are in homes, and this will probably be true for some time to come. Indeed, good home day care offers many advantages to the children in care. But day care mothers need recognition, training, technical assistance and encouragement.

training and certifying quality personnel

The central issue in the provision of adequate personnel for early childhood development programs is not numbers. It is insuring quality of staff training and making it possible to utilize personnel with a variety of backgrounds for a variety of tasks. It has been estimated that if every three-, four- and five-year-old were in some form of preprimary program, 800,000 additional personnel would be required to maintain a ratio of one adult to every ten children. Since it is not recommended that all of these children be in classrooms, the need for teachers will not be that great.

The growing surplus of teachers and Ph.D.'s in some specific fields has been widely noted. This factor, however, and the probability that out-of-work elementary school teachers particularly will be available for preprimary positions should not be considered an easy solution to the personnel problems of early childhood education. With adequate planning and a well-designed on-the-job training program, however, adequate numbers of people can be trained.

The key point is that teachers and administrators for early childhood education require qualifications and training different from their counterparts working with older children. Certification procedures and teacher training programs should reflect this fact. For example, for the effective implementation of the program alternatives outlined in this report, a new type of professional early childhood educator will be required. Because emphasis should be on the full development of very young children in a variety of environments but particularly in the home and with the family, the early childhood

specialist must be able to muster and coordinate all the resources needed to foster full human effectiveness, wherever they may be located. At their best, such specialists will be sufficiently free from direct administrative ties to be able to help parents and children get better services from all existing agencies, to arrange for services not yet provided and to assist policy-makers in strengthening legislation and administrative structures. In many cases, they will be expected to perform difficult diagnostic functions to determine which youngsters may need more intensive attention before first grade.

In addition, many other staff positions will require training. Extensive provisions should be made to train teacher assistants to assist in and often take responsibility for the teaching-learning process. As Head Start programs have demonstrated, mothers and others from the community can with special on-the-job training—but without formal degrees and meeting present certification standards—fill significant staff roles for early childhood programs. Head Start has already opened the way for the use of aides and assistants in many public schools. Federal Follow Through programs for low-income children in kindergarten through third grade make extensive use of them.

The Hartford, Connecticut, public school system has an early childhood program which includes a particularly strong training effort for teachers and aides. Every teacher is assisted by an aide who must have a high school diploma or the equivalent and is paid approximately $4,000 a year for fulltime classroom assistance. All teachers and aides are required to attend a three-week training session. The budget includes funds to pay substitutes for teachers attending the session during the year and aides receive their regular salaries. For summer training, teachers receive the amount a substitute teacher would cost for the period and aides get $75 a week.

The requirements for a teacher in a day care center might be comparable to that of a Head Start teacher, but standards and training would also be necessary for individuals who operate day care homes for four or five children. Probably some prior training should be required on such topics as health and safety standards and nutrition. Introductory instruction would also be necessary on simple concepts of child growth and development. Beyond that, a good system of constructive supervision and on-the-job training could develop competent individuals to operate such programs.

Seattle's Neighborhood House Child Care Services program offers an interesting career ladder approach for day care personnel.

There are four levels: The first, or entry level, is for trainees who observe and increasingly assume responsibility for working with other staff, parents and children. Trainees are expected to attend classes at a local community college when funds are available. Level two staff are intern teachers and expected to work independently. Level three staff are assistant teachers who may have up to three years of experience and 42 college credits. The position of head teacher, level four, requires a minimum of two years experience and 45 credits toward an associate of arts degreee. The career ladder for day care home mothers is similar with three levels. A mother with little or no background can move through all three levels in three to five years and should have accumulated 45 credit hours, which entitle her to an early childhood education certificate or a certificate related to the field of social work.

Possible State Action

A state plan for training and certification should satisfy the following conditions:

1. It should provide for the training and certification of a variety of different positions.
2. It should provide for career development so that a person can enter as an assistant teacher and advance as he receives training and experience.
3. It should provide a variety of ways to receive training—at colleges and universities, on-the-job, and independent study.
4. It should provide a basis for awarding a certificate that is not solely based on a specified number of college credit hours that are tied to a specified number of hours of study. For example, a person should be able to demonstrate some competence in the classroom and receive credit without taking a course.
5. It should provide a way for increased competency to be reflected in increased compensation.

In attempting to meet its personnel needs for early childhood education programs, states should take some or all of the following steps:

1. Establish credentials in early childhood education or at least provide for a strong specialization in early childhood education within the preparation of an elementary certificate —with the recognition that an effective early childhood educator must be able to encourage a child's development within his total environment.

2. ***Establish the same salary schedules, fringe benefits and tenure rights for early childhood teachers as for all other teachers,*** in an effort to encourage qualified individuals to enter the field and to make preprimary education an integral part of the state's elementary system. Flexibility should be of prime concern so that women with other responsibilities might be able to be certified without rigid residency and time requirements in formalized training.

3. ***Encourage the development of postsecondary and inservice programs for professional and other positions, through a variety of actions,*** including:

—a program of incentive grants to state colleges and universities to encourage them to include specialized graduate programs in their schools of education and undergraduate B.A. programs in early childhood education:

—a program of incentive grants to state junior and community colleges to provide courses in early childhood education;

—the development of programs for retraining—through formal efforts in two-year and four-year institutions and through inservice programs—credentialed elementary school teachers wanting kindergarten positions;

—the establishment of a limited number of model demonstration centers to provide inservice training for professional and paraprofessional personnel prior to the expansion of the state program.

4. ***Develop programs particularly suited to training teaching aides, parents, siblings and other young people to assist with the wide range of program alternatives.*** Emphasis might be placed, for example, on creative training for high school students through cooperation with courses on human growth and development and part-time employment programs. Although many school districts include some such training in home economics classes, it appears that a different orientation would be more effective and would attract both boys and girls interested in working with the very young. Such a program would have the benefits of preparing prospective parents, encouraging more dedicated individuals to enter early childhood careers and spilling over to younger brothers and sisters at home.

Special training programs for parents are particularly appropriate for some of the parent/child approaches attracting growing attention across the country. Experience indicates, for example, that

one teacher or someone who had been a successful teacher in a kindergarten or Head Start classroom could in one year educate 200 adults in how to use a toy library with their own children. Either one could operate the program after a week of special training and some assistance during the first and perhaps second course sequence.

*5. **Organize and train volunteers as teachers' assistants.*** The National Program for Voluntary Action offers an important vehicle which might be utilized at the state level to provide focused volunteer service for early childhood efforts. The program consists of two parts: a Cabinet Committee on Voluntary Action created by President Nixon in 1969 and an Office of Voluntary Action in the government sector; and a National Center for Voluntary Action (NCVA) which is a privately funded, nonpolitical, nonprofit corporation. The two parts collaborate closely to assist in the setting up of volunteer programs. Several states, including New York, Illinois and Washington, have already set up volunteer bureaus. Such bureaus—particularly if assisted by state funds for special training needs—might provide an important source of trained assistants.

providing adequate physical facilities

All state efforts to develop facilities and regulate their standards must be accompanied by three caveats: There must be a basic recognition of the need for flexibility in creative design; there must be a realization that a variety of different kinds of facilities will require a more flexible set of standards; and there should be adequate provision for state aid for construction of different kinds of facilities when funds are needed. As the establishment of formal classroom preschools and kindergartens are not a primary recommendation of this task force, it should be noted that many of the alternatives discussed in this report would require no, or only minimal, classroom space.

Nevertheless, it is assumed that under any alternative, at least some space for groups of children needing special attention—the mentally and physically handicapped—will be desirable. The first and most obvious step to take would be a careful assessment of existing facilities. The decline of the elementary school population will mean that some public school districts may have empty classrooms that can be utilized for kindergarten and preschool children. Growing interest in rescheduling the school calendar so that some students would attend regular sessions during the summer and vacation at other times of the year suggests that more districts will adopt extended school year programs, thus releasing space for early childhood education. It has been pointed out, for example, that a year-round program in North Carolina would provide adequate space for kindergartens statewide without laying a single brick.

Ways to Provide Adequate Facilities

Unless some minimal standards are established, formal classroom programs probably should not be undertaken. Too often the standards that are set and enforced have nothing to do with education. They are usually justified as health and safety standards but often the rigid enforcement of rules has no relationship to health or safety. Obviously, the health and safety of children must be protected, but a review of the applications of specific rules is certainly in order. Educational standards should also be established that go beyond statements of minimal space per child. For example, some regard for equipment and materials is essential.

If it is necessary and in many communities it will be necessary to provide additional facilities for groups of young children, provision should be made to allow for a variety of solutions to the problem.

The development of prefabricated structures that can be located on school grounds and that meet current standards offers an important method of meeting space needs at lower cost than new construction of traditional school buildings. For example, the Educational Facilities Laboratories (EFL) has designed and constructed with modular units an Early Learning Center in Stamford, Connecticut. The 4,000-square-foot, one-story school house, for children between two and eight, costs only $14 a square foot exclusive of site preparation.

If a state determines that its needs for additional facilities for early childhood programs will be substantial, it might examine carefully and consider revision of existing legislation and regulations related to classroom space. Problems presented in some states by unclear or seemingly unrealistic fire, safety, and building codes have made it extremely costly to develop needed new facilities for expanded day care and child development services. The success of Head Start programs in nonschool space suggests that—with full recognition of the complications involved—the time has come for code revision.

HEW's Office of Child Development is now conducting a study of licensing processes for state and local day care in each of the 50 states. It is anticipated that the study will provide information to assess the level at which adequate protection of children can be assured while maintaining reasonable standards, and will culminate—by the end of 1971—in a suggested licensing code. Obviously, such a code would have important implications for current state practices with regard to both day care and preprimary education.

funding state early childhood programs

Effective early childhood education will cost money. Although some of the alternatives outlined in this report are lower in cost than full-scale classroom programs, any movement by the states into this field will demand the reallocation of current funds or an increase in the total educational budget. Hard decisions about funding priorities must be made. And there will be opposition. In some states there is already evidence that elementary and secondary teachers and groups with other program concerns—fearing loss of funds for their interests —will fight extension of early childhood programs.

There are conflicting approaches espoused by experts in the field. On the one hand, for example, the National Educational Finance Project, directed by Dr. R. L. Johns of the University of Florida, argues that the states have the fiscal capacity to provide full support for statewide kindergarten and prekindergarten programs. The first step, according to the Project, must be to restructure their financial base and to allocate the increased revenue to the schools. On the other hand, a preliminary assumption of a special study being conducted in Massachusetts is that a compulsory state-financed early childhood education program requiring a major redistribution of education resources is neither necessary nor feasible. The study anticipates that the bulk of financing for early childhood education in the foreseeable future will continue to come from private sources. The study, being done by Harvard's Program in Clinical Psychology and Public Practice, has been funded by the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education to assist in the effective implementation of kindergarten programs in all Massachusetts school districts, as will be required by 1973.

It is our contention, however, that to implement programs in the near future a state will have to work within its present tax base and that, to launch an effective program of any kind, there must be clear and substantial commitment to state funding of the effort. Important initiatives can be promoted with small state grants and incentive programs, and these must be considered in the early stages. A full-fledged statewide program, however, will thrive only with the certainty and support provided by consistent state aid. Our approach, suggesting various program patterns of ranging costs, is intended to fit varying state needs and capabilities.

Current State Efforts and Costs

Thirty-eight states provide some form of state aid to kindergarten; of those 28 allocate the aid through the state foundation program. Per pupil expenditure in 1969-70 ranged from $17 in Nebraska to $400 in Iowa and $900 for North Carolina's pilot program. Six states (California, Connecticut, Iowa, New Jersey, Virginia and Washington) provide some form of support for prekindergarten programs.

There are new directions under consideration at the state level. New York Commissioner of Education Nyquist has recommmended that the state include kindergarten and prekindergarten education in the state foundation program, and the New York State Board of Regents has proposed that state prekindergarten programs be available to all four-year-olds by 1971. Maryland's Governor Marvin Mandel has backed a plan to accommodate all the state's three- and four-year-olds in preschool centers by 1980. An initial $2 million is being requested from the Maryland Legislature this year for a coordinated pilot program in seven centers. In Florida, the 1971 legislature will consider a proposal to provide early childhood compensatory education for children between the ages of three and eight through special annual grants to school districts.

For state by state information on early childhood funding and personnel programs, see Appendix C.

The variation in what the states are currently spending per child in public schools and in the costs of the variety of possible approaches to ea ly childhood education is so great that any single cost estimate would be misleading. However, if a state expects to provide three hours of education in a classroom each day of a school year for a preschool child, a reasonable estimate of operating costs would be one

OPERATING COST ESTIMATES OF ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM APPROACHES PER 1,000 CHILDREN

Age Group Served	*Cost Per 1,000 Children*						
	$10,000	*$30,000*	*$50,000*	*$70,000*	*$90,000*	*$100,000*	*Combined Total*
0		(1) demonstration/ parent education centers with diagnostic services at $25 per child for all 0-4-year-old children. Total: $25,000.		(2) Adequate day care for 17% of families not able to afford it. On sliding scale, at average of $350 per child for 170 families as supplement to current family day care expenditure to help meet total cost of $1500 per child. Total: $59,500	(3) Combination of demonstration/ parent education centers (1) and day care supplementary funds (2) would cost between $85 and $100 per child and total about $85,000 to $100,000.		(3) $85,000 to $100,000 or $85 to $100 per child.
1-year-olds							
2-year-olds							
3-year-olds							
4-year-olds	(7) Assist 3% of children to attend private preschools and/or kindergartens, at average of $300 per child. Total: $9,000.		(5) Support and extend Head Start for 10% of needy youngsters not being served by providing $500 supplement per child toward $1500 cost. Total: $50,000.	(6) Adequate day care for 17% of families not able to afford it. On sliding scale at average of $350 per child for 170 families as supplement to current family day care expenditure to help meet total costs of $1500 per child. Total: $59,500.	(4) Parent/child program like toy library for 70% of 4s and 5s, $100 per child. Total: $70,000.		(8) $190,000 or $190 per child.
5-year-olds							

and one-half times the average cost for an elementary school child. This estimate assumes that the pupil-teacher ratio probably should not exceed ten to one but that only one out of two teachers would be a professional. The second person could be a trained assistant. Further, this estimate would include only classroom instruction. Any additional services, such as health, home coordinators or psychological services would entail additional costs. Since there are a variety of less expensive alternatives, however, a reasonable guess at the minimal cost to the state would be one half of this figure or about three-fourths of the cost of each elementary school pupil.

The cost of such a program must be viewed in context, however, because the expenditures of money on early childhood education can and probably will reduce other later costs in the educational system and elsewhere. Good education at a young age is always less costly and better for the child than remedial education later. An early childhood program can also provide employment for a number of people who otherwise would be forced to accept welfare.

The key factor in cost consideration, however, is the possibility of alternative approaches which would be substantially less expensive than the provision of classroom programs for all youngsters. The following examples illustrate the kinds of programs a state could undertake with an indication of cost per 1,000 children. They should prove helpful in a state's initial examination of the cost implications of combining various program alternatives. They are, however, very general estimates intended only to provide rough cost outlines.

*1. **Maintain children's education centers for parents of all children below the age of four.*** These centers would include diagnostic services to assess the development of the child and to provide special assistance for parents whose children have special problems. These centers could probably operate for a cost of about $25 per child or about $25,000 per 1,000 children from 0 to 4. This cost does not include the substantial capital expenditure need to start up such a program.

*2. **Provide for supervising and assisting day care centers for children below the age of four whose parents need such services.*** A reasonable estimate of actual cost is from $1,200 to $1,800 per child in most areas, or an average of about $1,500.

Across the nation about one-third of the mothers of children younger than six are working. At least one-half of these mothers, or 17 percent of families, would need some assistance to afford adequate day care service. So, about 170 of every 1,000 parents would need

some assistance. Many families are now spending $15 to $20 a week or $1,000 a year on non-licensed day care or babysitting, and with some supplementary assistance could afford adequate day care. If the state provided such assistance on a sliding scale ranging from $200 to $500, the average support would be $350 per child. This support might go to the parent to use at some private licensed center or as matching funds to a federally-supported program or to an industrially-supported program. The total state expenditure to offer adequate day care for the 17 percent of families needing extra assistance would be $59,500 per 1,000 children.

3. ***These two recommendations might be combined.*** Then the cost of providing demonstration/parent education diagnostic centers for all children younger than four and additionally assisting 17 percent of these families to obtain adequate day care would be about $85,000 per 1,000 children or close to $100 per child. With such an expenditure, the state would be providing services for 100 percent of the parents of children under four and supplementary day care assistance for those least likely to be able to obtain it on their own.

4. ***Provide a parent/child program like the toy library for at least 70 percent of parents of four-year-old children.*** If a state does not have a kindergarten program, this would include five-year-olds. The cost of this program should not exceed $100 per child or $70,000 per 1,000 children.

5. ***Support and expand Head Start type programs.*** Assuming that these programs are serving the children with the greatest need, the state would give them maximum support. Assume furthermore that 20 percent of the state population qualifies for Head Start on the basis of income level. But of this number, one half will need full day care services instead of a Head Start program. So 10 percent of four- and five-year-olds would be best served by a Head Start program. The average cost of a Head Start program is $1,000 per child. If the state contributed $500 per child for 100 children, the cost would be $50,000 per 1,000 children.

6. ***Support and expand day care service for four- and five-year-olds.*** The same logic applies to day care for fours and fives as for children under four discussed in recommendation two above. Seventeen percent of families (170 of every 1,000) would benefit from supplementary assistance averaging $350 per child (one child of this age group per family), for a total cost of $59,500 per 1,000 children.

7. ***Provide minimal assistance so that children can attend private nursery schools and kindergartens, particularly if no***

public programs exist. In many instances this will be for the convenience of the parents, and they should receive only the minimal support which would otherwise have been provided for a parent/child program under recommendation four above. In other instances, however, a half-day nursery program may be indicated for the physical or mental health of parent or child, and state support could be as high as $500 per child. Perhaps three percent of four- and five-year-olds (30 of every 100) would take advantage of this aspect of a state program. The average per child expenditure might be $300, or $9,000 for every 1,000 youngsters.

8. Recommendations four, five, six and seven might be combined. In such a comprehensive state program, the total cost for each 1,000 children of the four- and five-year-old age group would be:

(4) Support of a parent/child program for 70% of age group $70,000
(5) Support Head Start for 10% of age group..... 50,000
(6) Support day care for 17% of age group..... 60,000
(7) Support for nursery programs for 3% of age group.. 9,000

The total approaches $190,000 per 1,000 children or almost $200 per child for four- and five-year-olds.

This discussion of costs is based upon the assumptions that the federal government is going to continue to fund Head Start and initiate the funding of day care programs for low-income groups and that the combination of the two programs will serve all low-income families that qualify. The discussion also highlights the need for a careful study of a state's needs and resources. The estimates of cost are based upon national statistics, and in some instances they are open to question. Because the use of health and welfare funds, educational funds, and federal grants of various kinds would be anticipated, any estimate of the need for additional money would have to be carefully examined.

It appears, however, that a state could insure some kind of program for all of the children under the age of six and upgrade the services for all children for an expenditure of $100 to $200 per child.

Principles and Techniques

The fundamental point is that the various states must develop sound principles of financing for their early childhood education programs. Basic elements of a sound financing effort include: (1) provisions to insure that early childhood education is treated as an integral part of the state's overall education program; (2) insurance that early

childhood education will not be subject to the inconsistencies of categorical aid but will benefit from a steady flow of state funds; and (3) provisions which make it possible to provide funds on an equalization basis so that particularly needy districts can enjoy quality programs.

Within this framework states should consider some or all of the following techniques:

1. Inclusion of early childhood programs in the state foundation formula, if the foundation program has proven to be an effective method of distributing state aid. Such an approach would reflect the three principles noted above and utilize an established funding pattern. Of course if a state has no foundation program or that program has had only limited impact, this approach would not be recommended. If a state adopts an administrative structure for early childhood education that is outside of the state department of education, this approach might complicate coordination efforts.

2. Establishment of a special early childhood education fund within the state's education budget, if there is not an effective foundation program and no immediate plans for establishing one. Although the almost random proliferation of special funds (in 1967 there were at least 441 funds making up the school finance programs of the 50 states) suggests confusion and even contradiction of legislative intent, the initiation of a special early childhood education fund would assure some priority to the financing of the

program. Special provisions should be made for equalization and every effort made to assure some continuity in funding levels from year to year.

*3. **Establishment of a special state fund to include all expenditures for early childhood programs (including education, health, nutrition, day care, etc.).*** Moneys from such a general fund would be allocated to one central state agency administering all early childhood programs, if that alternative for state administrative structure were adopted. Such an approach would effectively encourage consolidation and coordination of the variety of existing state programs for very young children. Being different from the traditional approach by which funds are allocated by category to specialized agencies (eduation, health, welfare, etc.), such a funding pattern would not be advisable if early childhood programs were to be administered by the state department of education or other existing agencies.

*4. **Provision for construction funds for early childhood facilities.*** If construction funds for elementary-secondary needs are already provided by the state, such funding provisions should be extended to include early childhood facilities. If construction funds are not now provided, a special early childhood education construction program should be initiated.

*5. **Provision to ensure maximum use of federal matching funds and adoption of the principle by the state agency administering early childhood programs that priority will be given to plans using matching funds or joint federal or other public or private funding.*** In California, for example, the legislature in 1965 established the State Preschool Educational Program by amending the Welfare and Institutions Code to declare that "preschool programs with a strong educational component . . . constitute an essential component of public social services." The legislature instructed the State Department of Social Welfare to contract with the State Department of Education to provide federal welfare funding to a statewide system of preschool programs. The programs are for three- to five-year-olds from low income families and operate under standards adopted by the State Board of Education. Seventy-five percent of program costs come through Title IV of the Social Security Act and 25 percent through state budgetary appropriation. No parent fees or local funds are used. The average cost per child is $1,049.

In Colorado, it has been proposed that a statewide system of preschool programs for three- and four-year-olds, funded at about $1,000 per child, could be initiated if the State Department of Education were

to contract with the State Department of Social Services. Federal matching money from Title IV of the Social Security Act could be obtained on a 3-1 matching basis. If the state provided only $300,000, the federal funds would total $900,000 and the beginning package would be $1.2 million. This could then be supplemented by local funds, so that the proportionate funding would be 50 percent federal, 25 percent state and 25 percent local.

Such efforts are also important in that they provide, through state initiative, for an educational component in what might otherwise be custodial day care programs.

Legislation proposed in 1971 in Florida for an "Early Childhood Compensatory Education Program" would provide funds for which local school boards could apply to set up special programs for disadvantaged children. The proposal includes two important features: (1) it would require that all applications "demonstrate that the school board has fully utilized all other sources of revenue, and the assistance of all volunteer aid offered by individuals and public and private organizations . . . and has effectively coordinated the same" and, (2) it would give priority "to plans which will allow for matching funds or for joint funding from the federal government or other public and private sources."

6. Development of a program of incentive grants to state colleges, universities, junior and community colleges for offering graduate, undergraduate and associate degree specializations in early childhood education.

7. Adoption of the principle that salaries for early childhood teachers should be equal to those of elementary school teachers and provisions established to provide whatever state support may be provided for elementary teachers' salaries to early childhood teachers.

8. Provision of parent education as an integral part of the state early childhood and/or adult education programs. Funds for parent training might be included in alternatives one, two or three outlined above. It would also be possible to provide funds through the state adult education program. In California, for example, the Education Code authorizes programs of adult education through child observation classes, parent nursery and child development classes. For the purposes of state support, the parents of children are regular adult education students and generate average daily attendance for reimbursement. State funds are provided at a rate of $0.35 per parent hour of instruction.

implementation

In the face of the several alternatives outlined in this report, the obvious question is what next? What steps should a state devise to insure consideration of the key issues in early childhood development, to establish priorities and to initiate programs?

The first priority must be to examine the adequacy of the state's current early childhood programs, in light of the directions and considerations suggested in this report, at a prominent level of government. Public attention and political influence must be devoted to early childhood programs if they are to reflect the needs of the state and to operate effectively.

As pointed out elsewhere in this report, a fundamental difficulty in maximizing the impact of existing efforts and—of course—in assuring future effectiveness is the duplication and competition caused by uncoordinated funding sources. The primary concern which will affect all programs—regardless of which alternative approaches are selected —is the effectiveness of the administrative agency in bringing about cooperative and complementary programs and funding. If the state's examination of the implications of this report is initiated at the highest level of government, the ultimate chances of success will be that much greater.

There are several possible first steps. The governor might call a conference on early childhood development to examine the implications of this report. Or he might ask an existing state agency (the state department of education or social services or health) to sponsor such a study of the state's needs. He might also recommend to the

legislature that public hearings be held on the issue and that the legislative council be asked to report to the legislature on the implications of the various alternatives here outlined. Or all of these actions might be undertaken simultaneously.

Whatever technique is adopted to focus public attention on early childhood development, provisions should be made to collect the information on which decisions will have to be based. Each state should have at least the following data:

(1) The number of youngsters—by age—currently in day care, preschool, kindergarten or other preprimary programs and the number not being served at all. Five-year projections should also be made.

(2) An estimate of the number of families now desiring day care but not being served and the number in five years.

(3) An estimate of the number of children—by age—with special needs—physical, mental or emotional handicaps and the number now being served.

(4) The availability of early childhood personnel.

(5) Estimates of funds available for all types of early childhood programs from all sources—local, state and federal.

(6) Facilities available if needed and eligible under current state codes.

(7) Survey of all existing programs—whatever the funding source—by current administrative agency with a rough evaluation of the administrative effectiveness of those agencies.

Using such information, the educational and political leaders of the state—under the guidance of the governor and the state legislature—should be better able to assess the implications of the various alternative approaches for the state's particular needs.

A major purpose of the governor's conference and/or legislative action should be to identify an interagency committee to be responsible for following up on the steps necessary to develop and implement a state program. Such a committee—comprising at least representatives of the state departments of education, health and social services, the governor's office, the legislative education committees, the Head Start program and parents—should be responsible for drafting an implementation plan including a specific timetable, the gathering of additional data which may be necessary and identifying any legislation determined to be needed.

The key decision, of course, will be the structure to be adopted for the administration of early childhood development programs. The conflicts and vested interests in this field are already well established, and strong gubernatorial and legislative leadership will be required on this issue. The alternative program and funding approaches will be largely determined by this decision. It is probable that once the machinery for administering a stat. program is agreed upon and legislation, if necessary, enacted, that agency will assume further responsibility for program development.

The Education Commission of the States stands ready to assist the states in at least the following ways: (a) development of model legislation in key areas; (b) the identification of consultants to assist with legislative and administrative matters and program development; (c) the provision of consultants for selected problems on a limited basis; and (d) the continued provision of research information on best practices in early childhood education across the country.

appendix a: educational programs and goals for children

There are mixed opinions on how to start the educational process that will contribute to the development of young adults who can solve a variety of problems and are willing to try to solve them.

Some educators and psychologists who generally follow the psychological concepts of B. F. Skinner of Harvard University believe that the best approach is to state objectives in very explicit terms. Such as:

The child can count to ten.
The child can name nine colors.
The child can name four shapes.
The child can demonstrate an understanding of over, under, between, beside, etc.
The child can add and subtract combinations of numbers up to ten.

The objectives may all be very academic—related to language and mathematics or they might cover a wider range of activities but the crucial element is that they are explicit and stated in behavioral terms.

Once the objectives have been stated those educators and psychologists believe that the program should be systematically designed to accomplish those objectives. One such program stresses language and mathematics. The core of the program is three small group sessions where teachers present carefully designed lessons to teach specific objectives. This program does not stress the need to help children maintain or develop a healthy self-concept. The developers feel this will follow from a feeling of accomplishments the child has from academic achievement.

Another kind of program that is built around a carefully defined set of objectives—but using different teaching methods—is illustrated by the token reinforcement programs.

The idea is that children learn best when they receive tangible rewards. But no single reward, such as a grade, is valued by all of the children. Therefore, in this system, when a child accomplishes a learning task or behaves in some desired way, he receives a token that can later be exchanged for something the child values—some favorite activity or food, or even an extra play period.

A similar approach uses a menu of reinforcers; that is, after a child has completed a desired task he can point to the particular reward that he wants in a way that is similar to selecting food from a menu.

Another group of educators who are developing model programs believe that the use of specific objectives is a useful device but is too limited. They stress language development, concept formation, and problem solving but

are not as concerned about the specific content that is covered. Within limits, what the child learns, i.e., to count, to work a puzzle, to paint, to play a game, to say the ABC's, or to name animals is not so significant as the process that is involved. They want to help children learn how to learn so they stress problem solving or discovery learning. They also believe that considerable attention should be given to helping children either maintain or develop a healthy self-concept as it relates to learning and school. They reason that the schools not only have not done enough to develop healthy self-concepts but have actually been harmful by teaching some children that they are inferior because of their background or because they do not do well in school. Therefore, these educators stress individual learning and allow the child to set his own pace. They avoid using rewards and punishments such as grades or tokens and stress the use of self-rewarding activities—things children enjoy doing for their own sake.

This group of educators are more inclined to follow the theories of Piaget and Bruner than Skinner. The third general group is even more oriented toward the child growth and development theories. These program developers recognize the need for cognitive or intellectual development but they place a greater stress on such things as socialization, physical development and creativity. They also stress the process—learning how to learn rather than the content. They typically do not define their objectives in explicit behavioral terms because they do not believe that such objectives are appropriate.

These three general positions on objectives and approaches usually apply to classroom activities for three or four hours a day but they also can be applied to other approaches that do not involve the child in a formal classroom activity; for example, programs for parents who in turn teach their children at home, or home visitation programs, or mobile classrooms, or educational television, or a combination of these. In each instance the approach has a bearing on the objectives and methods but the three general positions remain the same.

It should be obvious that with this variation in the thinking of the leading educators and psychologists who are involved in developing model programs* that no single set of specific objectives would satisfy the "experts" but in many instances these differences are matters of approach and stress.

1. They all recognize the importance of early intellectual development.
2. They all recognize that intellectual development is only a part of early childhood education.
3. They all recognize the importance of individualizing the program to respond to the ability and needs of individual children.

Regardless of the specific objectives or the particular approach most of the authorities would agree that early childhood education programs should help young children develop:

1. the senses and perceptual acuity,

*For a much more detailed analysis of difference see, Eleanor Maclchy and Miriam Zellner, *Experiments in Primary Education,* Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., New York, 1970.

2. linguistic competence: i.e., grammatical capacity, vocabulary, articulation, and extensive use of expressed language,
3. concept formation ability, i.e., understand relation concepts like over, under, between, beside, and categories in classified systems like fruit, vegetables, and food,
4. the ability to note discrepancies,
5. the ability to anticipate consequences,
6. the ability to deal with abstractions, i.e., numbers, letters, and rules,
7. the ability to take the point of view of someone else,
8. the ability to make interesting associations,
9. the ability to plan and carry out multi-stepped activities,
10. the ability to use resources effectively,
11. the ability to attend to a task and still be aware of other activities, and,
12. the ability to solve a variety of problems, i.e., one's personal problems and problems involving other people.

All of the objectives mentioned above are cognitive or intellectual objectives. In addition to these most of the authorities agree that it is important to help young children develop social skills and a healthy self-concept. Some of the social objectives would be to develop the child's ability to:

1. get and maintain the attention of adults in socially-acceptable ways,
2. use adults as resources,
3. express both affection and hostility to adults,
4. lead and to follow peers,
5. express both affection and hostility to peers, and
6. compete with peers.

Some of these social objectives are closely related to how the child sees himself. So in some instances there is not a clear distinction between developing social skills and a healthy self-concept. Some of the objectives in helping children maintain or develop a healthy self-concept would be to:

1. make better estimates of their ability to perform a given task;
2. make realistic statements about themselves and their racial, cultural, or ethnic group. Statements will be both positive and negative, but more positive than negative;
3. be more willing to take reasonable risks of failure when confronted with a problem they can probably solve;
4. after answering a question or offering a solution for a problem, they will make more realistic statements about the probability of being right or wrong;
5. express feelings or opinions more frequently, with fewer non-committal responses, fewer stereotypes, and a greater variety of responses to such questions as, "How do you feel about _____?" or "What do you think about _____?";

6. express themselves more freely in writing, painting or picture-drawing;
7. learn from errors and corrections rather than feeling put down or rejected;
8. be able to express in verbal and non-verbal ways feelings of joy, happiness, fear and anger;
9. be able to use failure in a productive way;
10. take credit for accomplishments and failures;
11. be able to work within limitations and make the most of the limited situation.

It is impossible to discuss educational objectives without giving some attention to how these objectives are accomplished. All of the authorities agree on the importance of developing programs that will respond to individual needs and ability and will allow children to progress at different rates. This means that the objectives cannot be stated in fixed or absolute terms such as "the five-year-old child should be able to name the letters in the alphabet." This kind of objective is not realistic for several reasons.

Human beings and particularly young children vary greatly in their rate of growth and development as well as in their potential to learn. For example, most teachers of three- and four-year-old children assume that a child's ability or willingness to talk is related to his ability to comprehend language and, furthermore, that early talkers will be early readers. We know now that there is very little relationship between how much a child talks and how much he can understand. Furthermore, early language development does not necessarily predict early reading ability.

Because a young child is a product of a certain culture and a certain life style, children from different backgrounds have learned different things that are vital to them but not necessarily the things the school values and looks for in a child. The children from middle-class families come the closest to having the prerequisites the school usually expects, but many other children do not. A child may have learned how to care for himself all day on a city street or to look after younger brothers and sisters. Or a child may come to school with a well-developed language but it is Navaho, or Spanish, or different from the English used in school. We cannot expect these children to achieve the same objectives as those set for a child who comes to school speaking the language of the school and tutored previously in some of the things the school expects.

The mistakes made by most schools in this respect have been repeated over and over. A child comes to classrooms with a limited language ability in standard English or he does not know how to discriminate among colors. The teacher might say, "Go get the red book from the shelf." The child appears dull because he doesn't understand; the teacher wonders if he is retarded. She asks a psychologist to test him. The psychologist tests the child in English on his ability, among other things, to identify colors or name shapes. Of course, the child can't—that is why the teacher wanted him tested—and

thus, he is considered retarded. This situation may sound unreasonable—and it is; but such episodes do happen often. For example: The first racial analysis of California's 65,000 mentally retarded school children disclosed in January (1970) found that 2.14 percent of all the Spanish-surnamed children and an even higher proportion—3.6 percent—of all the Negro children have been funneled into classes for the noneducable so classified. This misplacement happens because of a preconceived notion of what the child should know when he enters school and testing the child in the language of the school when the child speaks another language or dialect.

One of the objectives of early childhood education must be to prevent this kind of tragedy from occurring. Over half of those Spanish-surnamed and Negro children in mentally-retarded classrooms in California probably have the ability to be in regular classrooms but have been mis-classified. The cost in human and financial resources is staggering.

This type of education, however, should not be thought of as compensatory. It is just good education. If a boy who grew up on a ranch in Wyoming wants to learn to sail, the instructor does not develop a compensatory educational program for him because of the lack of water in Wyoming not does he compare the boy's achievements to those of the son of a sailor. The instructor teaches the boy from Wyoming how to sail and measures the boy's progress in terms of what he knew when he started.

appendix b: summary of proposed federal legislation

The Comprehensive Child Development Act (H.R. 6748) was introduced in the House in March, 1971, by nearly 100 Republicans and Democrats including John Brademas (D—Indiana) and Orval Hansen (R—Idaho). Drafted after lengthy consultation with interest groups from similar legislation introduced in the 91st Congress (H.R. 19662), the 92nd Congress version of the bill does not provide any substantial degree of state control over early childhood programs. Instead, cities, counties, units of general local government, and private non-profit agencies, as well as states, may be designated as prime sponsors of early childhood services within their respective areas. States would receive last preference for such designation under the bill.

Although the measure has received wide bi-partisan support, it is anticipated that attempts will be made as the bill moves toward passage to enhance the state role in providing early childhood services. The bill provides for the consolidation of several of the largest federal early childhood programs and coordination of a number of other efforts, with the Office of Child Development in HEW serving as the focal point for the administration and coordination of early childhood programs.

Children from any economic level could participate in programs sponsored under this legislation, although fees would be charged according to ability to pay. Allocation of funds to states would take into account the number of youngsters below the poverty line, the number of children under six years old and the number of children of working mothers in each state.

The bill also provides assistance for personnel training and costs of acquiring or building facilities. In addition, a National Center for Child Development and Education would be established to coordinate research efforts and would be funded at $20 million annually.

Senator Mondale and a 30-member bipartisan group have introduced the Comprehensive Child Development Act in the Senate as well (S. 1512) as an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act. The Mondale version of the bill authorizes $2 billion for FY 73, $4 billion for FY 74, and $7 billion for FY 75. The House bill does not indicate a specific amount, but instead authorizes "such funds as may be necessary."

A bill stressing community planning and operational involvement has been introduced in the Senate by Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.). Entitled Comprehen-

sive Community Child Development Act of 1971 (S. 4577), the bill provides for representative Community Child Care Councils, designated by the Secretary of HEW, which would plan community services and coordinate them and for State Child Care Councils which would review community plans, coordinate services within the state, and provide technical assistance to operating programs. The Office of Child Development in HEW would become the single federal agency responsible for overseeing major programs for children. Authorizations for FY 1973 are $900 million; FY 1974, $1.8 billion; and, for FY 1975, $2.8 billion.

Senator Birch Bayh (D-Indiana) has proposed the Universal Child Care and Development Act of 1971 to set up a national network of child care centers. Like both the Brademas and Javits bills, the Bayh proposal includes the provision of broad services. The bill would establish public institutions called Child Service Districts to provide infant care, comprehensive preschool programs, day care and night care services to aid working parents and emergency care. Each district would be small enough to reflect the specific needs of its residents. Boards of directors would be elected from among parents of children served to insure direct community participation. State and local governments would be responsible for developing plans for district boundaries. To some degree, the Bayh bill also provides for program consolidation at the federal level. The bill calls for appropriations of $2 billion for FY 1971, $4 billion for 1972 and $6 billion for 1973.

Also in the Senate, Louisiana's Russell Long has introduced a proposal to establish a Federal Child Care Corporation which would provide services, such as technical assistance, but not funds, to public, nonprofit or proprietary agencies running or planning to establish child care services. Initial capital to set up a revolving fund would come from a $50 million Treasury loan to be repaid with interest from fees for service. Any facilities meeting the standards outlined in the bill would be eligible and aparently would not be subject to licensing or other regulations imposed by states or localities.

appendix c: state funding and personnel programs in early childhood development

Information in the following tables has been compiled from questionnaires sent to the states. Responses were received from 50 states, American Samoa, Guam and Puerto Rico. Included are: Table I—State contacts who submitted the information on which the tables are based; Table II—State funding of kindergarten and prekindergarten programs; Table III—Program administration and personnel development; and Table IV—Certification requirements and administration.

Eight states (including Maryland, Massachusetts and West Virginia which require programs by 1973) and Guam mandate school districts to offer kindergarten programs to all who want them. In Colorado, the Board of Education accredits school systems only if kindergartens are offered. At least 35 states, American Samoa and Puerto Rico have enacted legislation permitting kindergartens. Thirty-eight states, American Samoa and Puerto Rico provide some form of state aid to kindergartens; of those 28 allocate the aid through the state foundation program; and when North Carolina's pilot effort is fully funded, aid will be provided as part of the regular state support program. Per pupil expenditure in 1969-70 ranged from $17 in Nebraska to $400 in Iowa and $900 for the pilot North Carolina program.

Six states and American Samoa provide some form of support for prekindergarten programs. Connecticut provides $200 per pupil. Iowa allocates $780 per pupil to the Department of Social Welfare to use as matching funds for federal day care programs. New Jersey includes four-year-olds in its state-supported kindergarten programs. In Virginia, the State Departments of Education, Health and Welfare support prekindergarten programs. There is special state funding ($250 per pupil) for prekindergarten programs in 12 central city areas in Washington State. And in California, $1,000 to $1,400 may be expended per prekindergarten pupil.

At least 26 states offer some other state-supported services to pre-first graders, such as medical and dental care, nutritional programs or special programs for the handicapped.

State Certification Requirements for Early Childhood Personnel

Only 11 states require state certification for day care personnel, and in three of these (Connecticut, Maryland and New Jersey) the State Department of Education is the certifying agency for day care as well as all other early childhood positions requiring certification. In the other seven

(Indiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, Pennsylvania, Oregon and West Virginia), a different agency (the Public Health Department, the Department of Social Services or Welfare Department) certifies day care personnel.

Forty-seven states have certification requirements for kindergarten teachers and administrators, but only six require certification for kindergarten paraprofessionals. There are certification requirements for prekindergarten teachers and administrators in 20 states and for prekindergarten paraprofessionals in only two. The State Board of Education is the certifying agency in all instances except those five noted above and except in Illinois, which has a State Teacher Certification Board; New York, where the cities of Buffalo and New York are responsible in conjunction with the State Board of Education; and in Texas, which has the Texas Education Agency for Special Education Certification.

In 31 states an elementary certificate is applicable for kindergarten and/or prekindergarten teaching, though usually with an additional early childhood endorsement.

State Administrative Structure

The State Department of Education is the sole administrative agency responsible for kindergarten programs in 37 states and for prekindergarten in six. In five states the State Education Department shares responsibility with one or more other in agencies for kindergarten administration and in ten for prekindergarten. Where prekindergarten programs are not the responsibility of the State Department of Education, the State Department of Welfare or Social Services or Health has the sole or shares responsibility for them.

Only six states indicated that some form of formal coordination among administrative agencies exists; 13 classified the existing coordination as informal or a combination of informal and advisory. Two states listed their administrative system as advisory only.

State Programs for Personnel Development

Only two states (Idaho and North Dakota) and American Samoa have no post-secondary programs in early childhood education. Six have no colleges with degree programs; and 27 have no junior or community colleges with associate degree programs. Massachusetts offers the greatest number of all types of programs with New York and Virginia having the second greatest. Massachusetts has over 100 colleges with degree programs; New York has 24 and Virginia 16; Massachusetts has just fewer than 100 junior or community colleges offering associate degree programs; Virginia has 16 and New York has 10; Massachusetts has more than 250 colleges with some work in early childhood education; Virginia has 32 and all New York State University colleges offer some early childhood training.

Table I — Contacts for State Information

Alabama—O. P. Richardson, State Supt. of Education, State Dept. of Education, State Office Building, Montgomery 36104

Alaska—Mrs. Margaret K. Justice, Elem. Education Consultant, Alaska Dept. of Education, Alaska Office Building, Pouch F, Juneau, Alaska 99801

American Samoa—Dr. Betty Johnston, Director, Early Childhood, Government of American Samoa, Department of Education, Pago Pago, 96920

Arizona—Harvey Stern, Department Assoc. Supt., Department of Education, Capitol Building, Phoenix 85007

Arkansas—A. W. Ford, Commissioner, State Dept. of Education, Little Rock 72201

California—Al M. Loeb, Program Budget Manager, Dept. of Finance, Library and Courts Building, Sacramento 95814

Colorado—Virginia Plunkett, Colorado Department of Education, Colfax and Sherman, Denver 80203

Connecticut—Dr. Harriet C. Nash, Consultant, Early Childhood Education, State Department of Education, State Office Building, Hartford 06115

Delaware—Robert C. Hawkins, Director, Elem. Education, Dept. of Public Instruction, P. O. Box 697, Dover 19901

Florida—Minnie Lee Rowland, Administrator, Early Childhood Education, Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Georgia—Mary J. Gordon, Early Childhood Education Consultant, State Office Building, Atlanta 30334

Guam—Department of Education, P. O. Box DE, Agana 96910

Hawaii—Department of Education, Queen Liliuokalni Building, 1390 Miller Street, Honolulu 96813

Idaho—Roy E. Truby, Administrative Asst., Idaho State Office Bldg., Boise

Illinois—Dr. Earl W. Morris, Dir., Dept. of Curriculum Development, 325 S. Fifth Street, Springfield 62704

Indiana—Miss Barbara J. Anderson, Governor's Office of Community Affairs, 215 N. Senate, Indianapolis 46204

Iowa—Dr. Oliver T. Himley, Chief, Title I, E.S.E.A., Grimes State Office Building, Des Moines 50319

Kansas—C. M. Shenk, Asst. Commissioner of Education, 120 E. 10th St., Topeka 66612

Kentucky—Patrick West, Jr., State Department of Education, Frankfort 40601

Louisiana—State Dept. of Education, Mrs. Vera Lane, Supervisor of Elem. Education, P. O. Box 44064, Baton Rouge 70804

Maine—Dorothy Russell, State Dept. of Education, Augusta 04330

Maryland—Fred H. Spigler, Jr., Administrative Officer of Education, State House, Annapolis 21404

Massachusetts—Barbara L. King, State Supervisor, Kindergarten Education, 182 Tremont St., Boston 02111

Michigan—William F. Pierce, Deputy State Supt., Box 420, Lansing 48902

Minnesota—Miss Corinna Moncada, Early Childhood Education Consultant, Dept. of Education, Centennial Office Building, St. Paul 55101

Mississippi—Troy D. White, Supervisor of Elementary Education, State Dept. of Education, P. O. Box 771, Jackson 39205

Missouri—Dr. Arthur L. Mallory, Commissioner, State Dept. of Education, Jefferson City 65101

Montana—Dolores Colburg, State Supt. of Public Instruction, Capitol Building, Helena 59601

Nebraska—Governor's Office, State Capitol, Lincoln 68509

Nevada—John R. Gamble, Deputy Supt., State Dept. of Education, Carson City 89701

New Hampshire—Miss Cynthia E. Mowles, Consultant, Early Childhood Education, Department of Education, 410 State House Annex, Concord 03301

New Jersey—Mrs. Dorothy Gibson, Division of Curriculum and Instruction, N. J. State Dept. of Education, 225 West State Street, Trenton 08625

New Mexico—Harry Wugalter, State Capitol Building, Santa Fe 87501

New York—Mrs. Dorotha M. Conklin, State Education Dept., Albany 12224

North Carolina—Dr. Craig Phillips, State Supt., State Dept. of Public Instruction, Raleigh

North Dakota—M. F. Peterson, Supt. of Public Instruction, State Capitol, Bismarck 58501

Ohio—Eugene Wenger, State Department of Education, 65 S. Front Street, Columbus 43215

Oklahoma—Sally Augustine, State Dept. of Education, Oklahoma City 73105

Oregon—Jean Spaulding, Oregon Board of Education, 300 Public Service Building, Salem 97310

Pennsylvania—Dr. John E. Kosoloski, Dir., Bureau of General and Academic Education, State Dept. of Education, Box 911, Harrisburg 17126

Puerto Rico—Dr. Ramon Mellado, Secretary of Education, Dept. of Education, Hato Rey 00919

Rhode Island—William P. Robinson, Jr., State Dept. of Education, Hayes St., Providence 02908

South Carolina—Janet Stanton, Supervisor of Early Childhood Education, S. C. State Dept. of Education, 803 Rutledge Building, Columbia 29201

South Dakota—Charlotte Hauge, Early Childhood Consultant, Box 853, Northern State College, Aberdeen 57401

Tennessee—Dr. John E. Cox, Tennessee Dept. of Education, Cordell Hull Building, Nashville, Tenn. 37219

Texas—Mrs. Jeannette Watson, Early Childhood Development Program, P. O. Box 2428, Capitol Station, Austin 76011

Utah—G. Morris Rowley, 1400 University Club Building, Salt Lake City 84111

Vermont—Gerald H. Greemore, Ex. Sec., Committee on Children and Youth, Riverside Building, Montpelier 05602

Virginia—S. P. Johnson, Jr., State Dept. of Education, Richmond 23216

Washington—Robert Groeschell, P. O. Box 527, Olympia 98501

West Virginia—Arch A. Moore, Jr., Governor, Capitol, Charleston 25305

Wisconsin—Department of Education, 126 Langdon St., Madison 53702

Wyoming—Mrs. Patricia G. Wunnicke, Coordinator of Public Information, Capitol Building, State Dept. of Education, Cheyenne 82001

Table II — State Funding Effort:

State	Kindergarten Mandatory (M) or Permissive (P)	Additional Information on Kindergarten	Kindergarten Entrance Age	State Expenditure Kindergarten Total 1968-1969	Total 1969-1970	Per Pupil 1968-1969	Per Pupil 1969-1970
Alabama	P (in cities)	No state aid	5	None			
Alaska	P	State aid provided to kindergarten as part of state foundation program at one-half amount for elementary school pupils.	5 By Nov. 2	Not available			
American Samoa	P	3-, 4-, and 5-year-olds are taught together in village houses. 3,000 now enrolled. Plan to have all 3,500 qualified for program funded through Department of Education enrolled by 1971-1972. Budget from Gov. of American Samoa.	Entrance to level 1 if 6 by Dec. 31	Prelimary four-week program only in 1968-1969. Includes funds for 3-, 4- and 5-year-olds.	$84,000	FY 1971 figure averages $60 per pupil.	$42
Arizona	P	Local school district tax supports public kindergarten programs. Department of Education has produced kindergarten guide and lends advisory support where needed.	5 by Dec. 31	None			
Arkansas	P	There is no state aid granted local school districts for kindergarten programs. There are four projects involving eight institutions and 16 kindergarten classrooms. Annual appropriation for research and teacher training—FY 1969, $160,000; FY 1970, $200,000.	5 by Oct. 1	None			
California	M	State aid as part of foundation program—ADA.	4 years 9 months	$78.3 million	$245 million	Not available	
Colorado	P	Required for accreditation but not required by statute. State aid as part of foundation program.	Schools must accept at 6 years.	Not available		Varies district to district with foundation program.	
Connecticut	M	Aid provided as part of foundation program.	5 by Jan. 1	$11.3 million	$11.5 million	$200	$200
Delaware	P	State aid provided to kindergarten as part of foundation project.	5 by Jan. 1	$935,908	$1.6 million	$182	$203
Florida	P	Aid based upon approved instruction units for kindergarten. No state effort to promote prekindergarten programs.	5 on or before Jan. 1	$6,265,981	$9,500,000	$339	$335

Prekindergarten				Additional Information on Prekindergartens	Other State-Supported Services to Pre-First Graders (Medical, Dental, etc.)
Total		Per Pupil			
1968-1969	1969-1970	1968-1969	1969-1970		
None				No state effort to promote.	Some medical services and day care for ADC children.
None				Many agencies have been working in past two years to ask that legal school age be lowered to three. Preschool would be optional.	Partially—through public health and welfare services.
3- and 4-year-olds grouped with 5s.					Free medical and dental care for all Samoans.
None					Through Health and Welfare Departments, some programs offer additional services.
None				None	Through Health and Welfare.
$16 million	$16 million	$1,000-$1,400	$1,000-$1,400	Promotion of prekindergarten programs in cooperation with federal Head Start, children's centers, etc. State Preschool and Migrant Day Care Programs.	Medical, Social Services, Nutrition.
None				Promotion of prekindergarten but no funding.	Day care
$488,400	$619,000	$200	$200	State provides consultants, evaluation, workshops, etc. State aid provided if operated by local board of education and meeting certain legal requirements (certified teachers, not less than 180 days, not less than 2½ hours daily).	Nutritional services provided through federal school lunch programs. Other services available through Welfare Department.
None				Governor and State Board of Education support public prekindergarten education. Legislation for pilot prekindergarten program may be introduced this year.	Through Head Start and Day Care programs. State Board of Health provides medical and dental assistance.
None					None

Table II — State Funding Effort (continued)

State	Kindergarten Mandatory (M) or Permissive (P)	Additional Information on Kindergarten	Kindergarten Entrance Age	State Expenditure Kindergarten Total 1968-1969	Total 1969-1970	Per Pupil 1968-1969	Per Pupil 1969-1970
Georgia		No state support for kindergartens. But Atlanta and Columbus have public kindergartens for all five-year-olds. Atlanta also has public pre-k and day care programs. 43 school systems have public kindergartens supported by ESEA Title I funds. Total expenditure for kindergartens in 1969-1970 was $73.8 million ($625 per pupil) and for pre-k was $672,527 ($625 per pupil).		None			
Guam	M	Federally supported through ESEA, Title I, Head Start. 1,000 kindergarten students in 1969. 550 in 1970.	5	$391,247	$244,597	$391	$445
Hawaii	P	98.2 per cent of five-year-old population of 16,817 are enrolled in kindergartens, both public and private. Only 2,615 of them attend private programs.	5 by Dec. 31	$4.8 million	$5.6 million	$339	$401
Idaho		A kindergarten bill has been introduced which, if passed, would provide 100 per cent state supported permissive kindergarten programs. Governor and State Superintendent of Public Instruction support it. At present there are 35 kindergarten programs operating with local and federal funds.		None			
Illinois	M	State aid as part of the regular school reimbursement program. Maximum per pupil dollar based on equalization formula.	5 on or before Dec. 1	Not available		$330	$400
Indiana	P	Kindergartens are provided state funds through State Department of Public Instruction within public school grant on half-day per capita basis.	5	$6.1 million	$9.8 million	$76	$118
Iowa	P	State aid provided through foundation program. State Department of program. State Department of Public Instruction provides leadership in upgrading kindergarten programs through consultative services and inservice workshops.	5	$12.5 million	$12.9 million	$229	$236
Kansas	P	State aid provided as part of foundation program, counted as one-half regular student.	5 on or before Sept. 1	Information not available on student basis, only on teacher basis.			
Kentucky		There are no public kindergartens.	5 by Dec. 31	None			

Prekindergarten					
Total		Per Pupil		Additional Information on Prekindergartens	Other State-Supported Services to Pre-First Graders (Medical, Dental, etc.)
1968-1969	1969-1970	1968-1969	1969-1970		
	None			Proposal for money before Legislature	None
	None			No promotion	Free medical and dental examination
	None			400 economically disadvantaged or physically handicapped 3- and 4-year-olds are enrolled in special programs. Also, 700 3- and 4-year-olds are in Head Start programs for which Department of Education is delegate agency. Comprehensive plans are in process for education—birth to age 4.	None
	None			Department of Education is designing a prekindergarten program. Within next year program proposed will be available.	
	None			State promotion of workshops for administrators and teachers. Department of Curriculum Development involved.	Yes, through Department of Public Welfare and local school districts.
	Only local and federal funds.				Pre-first grade medical, dental, nutritional, etc. services for children whose families are at or nearing poverty level.
$405,000	$405,000	$780	$780	None	State aid for handicapped prekindergarten children through Department of Public Instruction—$83 per pupil.
(appropriation to Department of Social Welfare to use as matching funds for federal day care program)					
	None			A program of early childhood education is being promoted.	None
	None			No state effort to promote prekindergartens.	None

Table II — State Funding Effort (continued)

State	Kindergarten Mandatory (M) or Permissive (P)	Additional Information on Kindergarten	Kindergarten Entrance Age	State Expenditure Kindergarten Total 1968-1969	Total 1969-1970	Per Pupil 1968-1969	Per Pupil 1969-1970
Louisiana	P	State aid on same basis as for grades 1-12. Teachers supplied on a 28-1 ratio.	4.8	Not available			
Maine	M	Aid as part of state foundation program.	5 by Oct. 15	Not available			$166
Maryland	M by Sept. of 1973	State aid at one-half pupil unit based on equalization formula.	5	$3.3 million	$3.7 million	$185	$185
Massachusetts	M by 1973	State aid provided as part of foundation program.	4.8	$18.8 million	$22.0 million	$298	$354
						These figures include funds for pre-kindergarten programs.	
Michigan	P	State aid provided as part of foundation program.	5 by Dec. 1	$46.3 million	$49.3 million	$251	$272
Minnesota	P	State aid as part of foundation program.	5 by Sept. 1	$6,752,763	$6,897,780	$108	$112
Mississippi		Legislation has been introduced in current legislative session which would provide public school kindergartens to be administered through State Department of Education. Governor's Committee on Children and Youth has supported legislation and stressed need for licensing day care centers.	5 by Dec. 1	None			
Missouri	P	Foundation program aid for kindergarten is based upon one-half of the total days attended by kindergarten children.	5	$4 million	$4.4 million	$118	$129
Montana	P	No state aid provided. Legislation for public kindergartens was rejected by 42nd Legislative Assembly.	5	None			
Nebraska	P	State aid as part of foundation program, based on ADM.	5 before Oct. 15	$494,048	$464,547	$17	$17

Prekindergarten				Additional Information on Prekindergartens	Other State-Supported Services to Pre-First Graders (Medical, Dental, etc.)
Total		Per Pupil			
1968-1969	1969-1970	1968-1969	1969-1970		
	None			State promotion of workshops for administrators and teachers. Department of Curriculum Development involved.	Yes, through Department of Public Welfare and local school districts.
	None			Attempt to pass early childhood education legislation.	
	None			State Board of Education Research Task Force charged with ongoing development.	Day care and nutritional (school lunch).
				Prekindergarten aid included in the entire kindergarten program.	
	None			State Board of Education, for fifth consecutive year, has endorsed legislation which would provide $1.5 million in state funds to be matched by $1.5 million in local funds for prekindergarten programs.	State funds for kindergarten can be used for auxiliary services such as health, nursing, examination, speech correction, school diagnostician, etc.
	None			Department of Education proposed permissive legislation for four-year-olds.	None
	None			None	None
	None			State Department of Education encourages local school districts to provide prekindergarten programs when local funds can be made available.	Children of families qualifying for state welfare may receive some additional services.
	None			None	None
	None			Individuals promoting.	Only those through private or federal funding.

Table II — State Funding Effort (continued)

State	Kindergarten Mandatory (M) or Permissive (P)	Additional Information on Kindergarten	Kindergarten Entrance Age	State Expenditure Kindergarten Total 1968-1969	Total 1969-1970	Per Pupil 1968-1969	Per Pupil 1969-1970
Nevada	P	State aid provided through foundation program.	5 by Dec. 31	⅙ of elementary per pupil in guaranteed basic support.			
New Hampshire	P	State aid as part of foundation program to those districts which qualify.	Local option	$230,595	$284,908	$312	$375
New Jersey	P	State aid as part of foundation program for 4- and 5-year-olds.	5 before Oct. 1	Not Available			
New Mexico	None	Existing kindergarten programs in NM are federally funded for Indian or disadvantaged children or military dependents. The State Department of Education has used some supplemental funds for pre-first programs in ready areas. House Bill 34 passed House Education Committee in February, would allow school districts to set up pre-primary programs with state funds.		None			
New York	P	1969-1970, $804 per child per year for full day, $302 per child per year for one-half day as part of foundation program.	4.9 by Sept. 1	$93 million		$604	$604
North Carolina	P	State funds now provided for 18 model development programs on two-year basis. State hopes to be at 25 per cent of need level by Sept. 1971. Aid will be provided as part of regular state support program when fully funded.	5 by Oct. 16	$500,000	$500,000	$900	$900
North Dakota	None	A bill providing for state aid for kindergarten failed in both the 1969 and 1971 legislative sessions.	5	None			
Ohio	P	State aid for kindergartens is provided through state foundation program. Legislation is being introduced in current session of General Assembly to lower compulsory school age to five.	5 by Sept. 30 or through early entrance testing if child is 5 before Jan. 1	Not available			
Oklahoma	P	State aid provided as part of foundation program; amount based on ADA.	5 by Nov. 1	None	$2.2 million	None	$66
Oregon	P		6 by Nov. 15 of year entering grade 1	None			
Pennsylvania	P	School districts receive reimbursement for instruction from the Department of Education at same rate for kindergarten as for any other grade level.	4	$24.9 million	$26.9 million	$300	$332
Puerto Rico	P	State funding. 397 kindergartens now exist.	5	$6 million	$6.8 million	$300	$342

Prekindergarten				*Additional Information on Prekindergartens*	*Other State-Supported Services to Pre-First Graders (Medical, Dental, etc.)*
Total		*Per Pupil*			
1968-1969	*1969-1970*	*1968-1969*	*1969-1970*		
	None			The State Department of Education has developed in their master plan for education a program for early childhood education, ages 3 to 5	None
	None			No state effort to promote prekindergarten	None
Not Available—$100,000 supplemental funds for year-round Head Start from State of New Jersey.				Money inducement—reimbursement for ages 4- and 5-year-olds enrolled in kindergarten	Same as for all other public school children.
	None			None	None
	None			None	None
	None			State supervision of federally-funded programs for disadvantaged.	Funds for diagnosis.
	None			Discussion now taking place on 3's and 4's, but there are no immediate plans.	Only through regular state health and social services.
	None			None	None
	None			None	None
	None			No state effort to promote prekindergarten programs.	Nutritional-School Lunch Division of State Department of Education. Medical, dental-public health clinics, university hospitals.
	None			State supervision of federally funded programs for disadvantaged.	Lunch services, limited medical services.
	None			A division of early childhood education was established in 1966 to service local districts through consultant visits, publication of guides and newsletters and to coordinate all educational preschool programs.	These services are available through various Department of Health and Welfare programs in addition to Department of Education offerings to enrolled pupils.
	None				Lunch services. Limited medical services. Day care services.

Table II — State Funding Effort (continued)

State	Kindergarten Mandatory (M) or Permissive (P)	Additional Information on Kindergarten	Kindergarten Entrance Age	State Expenditure Kindergarten Total 1968-1969	Total 1969-1970	Per Pupil 1968-1969	Per Pupil 1969-1970
Rhode Island	M	State aid as part of foundation program.	5 before Dec. 31	Breakdown by individual grades not available.			
South Carolina	P	Not part of foundation program. Annual grants to State Department for pilot program. $500,000 in both 1969-1970 and 1970-1971.	5 on or before Nov. 1	$500,000	$500,000	$145	$140
South Dakota	P	State aid under same minimum foundation grant as grades 1-12.	5 by Nov. 1	Information not available.			
Tennessee	P	Funds do not permit fully supported state program. Funds are used to finance limited program in each school district of state.	5 by Oct. 31	$350,000	$950,000	$280	$290
Texas		State aid provided in Sept. 1970 first to "educationally handicapped."	5 5 by beginning of school year Sept. 1	None.			
Utah	P	State aid as part of foundation program. Utah now has kindergarten program in all but two small rural districts.		Not available. Aid not tabulated according to grade.			
Vermont	P	State aid funds provided as part of overall state aid given school districts.	4½ or 5	No specific amounts. Kindergarten programs are added into student population figures for general state aid.			
Virginia	P	State aid as part of foundation program.	5	Information not available, included with other grades.			
Washington	P	State aid as part of foundation program.	5	$10.3 million	$9.7 million	$184	$185
West Virginia	M by 1973	Public kindergartens initiated in 1971. State expenditure for 1971-72 expected to be $3.5 million. State funds to be matched by federal funds insofar as possible.	5	None			
Wisconsin	P	State funds as part of foundation program at rate of one-half membership per enrollee.	5	No answer			
Wyoming	P	State aid as part of foundation program. 50 half-day students in ADM entitled to one "classroom unit" of $11,800 (1971-1972).	5 before Sept. 15	$325,977	$564,032	$82	$109

Prekindergarten					
Total		Per Pupil		Additional Information on Prekindergartens	Other State-Supported Services to Pre-First Graders (Medical, Dental, etc.)
1968-1969	1969-1970	1968-1969	1969-1970		
				Aid for prekindergarten on same basis as K-12.	Whatever is spent by local school committees for such services is reimbursable under state aid formula.
	None			No state promotion.	No state funds.
	None			Guidelines for nursery schools adopted. Early c[illegible]od office disseminates information.	Receives same services as grades 1-12.
	None			No state prekindergarten program.	Limited to those programs initiated and supported in part or in full with federal funds.
	None			State promotion, bilingual education and special education only.	Only those provided by federal funds.
	None				None.
None	$125,000	None	Not available	State aid for prekindergarten is 12½ per cent, local 12½ per cent to match Federal Title IV-C, Social Security Act in 4-C Program.	Some pilot demonstration projects, well-baby and immunization programs.
$97,422	$657,906	Not available		State Departments of Education, Health, Welfare, all promote prekindergarten. Local, state and federal funds available.	Medical care through local health departments. Dental treatment, nutrition consultation.
$25,000	$150,000	$250	$250	Special state funding for central city areas of which there are 12.	Special funding for the disadvantaged.
	None			Two Early Childhood Education Demonstration Centers opened in 1971. The state plan calls for 7 regional centers to serve children from 3 to 9. An important compnonent of the Centers is the coordination of the efforts of all agencies delivering services to young children.	25 per cent state support for day care with limited medical and dental services. Nutritional services for day care.
	None				These costs are a part of general state aid formulae. Services are encouraged and paid as are aids for other school services.
	None			No state promotion.	Well-clinic and crippled children's clinics through public health department.

Table III — Program Administration and Personnel Development

State	Administrative Agency: Kindergarten	Administrative Agency: Prekindergarten	Form of Coordination Among Administrative Agencies	State Programs for Personnel Development: No. of colleges with degree programs in early childhood education	No. of junior or community colleges with associate degree programs	No. of colleges with some work in early childhood education
Alabama	State Department of Education. Private organizations	Department of Pensions and Securities	Informal. No person designated as coordinator.	5	0	5 (in addition to those with degree programs)
Alaska	State Department of Education.	State Department of Health and Welfare. Head Starts are separate agencies with separate funding.	Formal. Meetings called to plan total preschool program with BIA, Department of Health and Welfare, Head Start, Department of Education and universities.	1	1	2
American Samoa	Program for 3, 4, and 5 year olds is administered by the combined state and local, as as one unit.		Not applicable	0	0	0
	There is preservice and inservice training for early childhood teachers by qualified professional personnel.					
Arizona	Local school districts administer their programs.	Health and Welfare	An early childhood association meets regularly. Current chairman is medical doctor from State Health Department.	0	0	3
Arkansas	State Department of Education and a few local school districts.	There are only private and parochial prekindergarten programs.	Informal. State Welfare Department supervises and licenses day care centers. State Health Department prepares and refines maintenance of health and sanitation standards.	3	1	9
California	Administered by local school districts. Department of Education provides administrative support.	State Department of Education Division of Compensatory Education.	4-C program. Joint funding with 39 community action groups. Purchase of service contracts between Welfare and Education.	6	54	61
Colorado	Local district	Department of Social Services and local district	Informal through 4-C. State Department of Social Services supervises and licenses day care centers and homes; Health Department oversees maintenance of health standards. Early childhood consultant from Education Department is on Governor's Licensing Board.	2	2	7
Connecticut	Local boards of education; many independent schools	Local boards of education; over 700 independent schools	Informal between programs administered by local boards of education and other local agencies and between state Board of Education and other state agencies. State Department of Health licenses all independent pre-k programs. State Department of Education carries the educational component of the licensing program.	7	1 (3 others pending)	11 (in addition to those offering degrees. Includes community colleges.)

Table III — Program Administration and Personnel Development (continued)

State	Administrative Agency: Kindergarten	Administrative Agency: Prekindergarten	Form of Coordination Among Administrative Agencies	State Programs for Personnel Development: No. of colleges with degree programs in early childhood education	State Programs for Personnel Development: No. of junior or community colleges with associate degree programs	State Programs for Personnel Development: No. of colleges with some work in early childhood education
Delaware	State Department of Education		Formal, informal and advisory through 4-C, almost daily contact with Office of Child Development. Early Childhood Education Supervisor is on Day Care Advisory Council.	2	0	3
Florida	State Department of Education	None		4	6	8
Georgia	State Department of Family and Children Services	State Department of Family and Children Services	Advisory	9	2	17
Guam	State Department of Education	State Department of Education	Not applicable	1	0	1
Hawaii	State Department of Education	Department of Social Services	Formal. Department of Social Services, after consultation with the Department of Health, Education, and fire marshal, prescribes and publishes rules, regulations and minimum standards for preschools. Administered by Department of Social Services.	1	0	3
Idaho	Proposed legislation would place kindergartens under local boards with general supervision of State Department of Education.			No answer	No answer	No answer
Illinois	State Department of Education	None		3	1	20
Indiana	State Department of Education	No state agency administration with exception of day care which is administered and licensed by state Department of Welfare.	Parent-Cooperative councils, Methodist Church Councils, Indiana Association for the Education of Young Children (Advisory and Coordination) and 4-C.	4	0	18
Iowa	State Department of Education	Department of Social Welfare	Informal	3	4	12
Kansas	State Department of Education	State Department of Health. Private day care centers and nursery schools.	Not applicable	not available	not available	not available
Kentucky	State Department of Education	State Department of Education	None	0	0	7
Louisiana	State Department of Education	State Department of Education. State Department of Public Welfare.	Formal. State Department of Education or Public Welfare.	7	0	19
Maine	State Department of Education	Department of Health and Welfare for Day Care centers.	Department of Health and Welfare advisory for Day Care Centers.	1	0	5

Table III — Program Administration and Personnel Development (continued)

State	Administrative Agency: Kindergarten	Administrative Agency: Prekindergarten	Form of Coordination Among Administrative Agencies	State Programs for Personnel Development: No. of colleges with degree programs in early childhood education	State Programs for Personnel Development: No. of junior or community colleges with associate degree programs	State Programs for Personnel Development: No. of colleges with some work in early childhood education
Maryland	State Department of Education	State Department of Education. Department of Employment and Social Services for Day Care.	Informal, advisory coordinating committee for child care.	3	3	9
* Massachusetts	State Department of Education	State Department of Education and Public Health Department.	. . .	Over 100	Less than 100	Over 250
Michigan	Local boards	Local boards	Not applicable	4	0	26
Minnesota	State Department of Education	Department of Public Welfare	Informal and advisory	8	2	10
Mississippi	. . .	. . .	. . .	3	0	10
Missouri	State Department of Education	Local public schools	Not applicable	2	2	11
Montana	State Department of Education	State Department of Education	. . .	1	0	3
Nebraska	State Department of Education	Welfare Department	. . .	3	0	6
Nevada	State Department of Education	Department of Health, Welfare and Rehabilitation administer nursery school and day care programs.	. . .	0	0	2
New Hampshire	State Department of Education	State Division of Welfare	. . .	2	0	7
New Jersey	State Department of Education	State Department of Education and Private; Department of Community Affairs; Bureau of Children's Services	Consultant service and compulsory approval.	5 State colleges	2 beginning paraprofessional programs.	All State colleges do.
New York	State Department of Education	State Department of Education, CAP, Private groups, Department of Social Services, Head Start, Churches.	Informal and advisory. More coordination is planned.	Approximately 24	10	All State University Colleges. Nursery—6th grade.
North Carolina	State Department of Education oversees pilot programs operated by local administrative units.	Social Service handles day care	. . .	0	0	35-40
North Dakota	Local districts	Local districts	None. State requirements and laws must be met by local districts.	No response	No response	No response
Ohio	State Department of Education	State Department of Public Welfare	None	3	?	29
Oklahoma	State Department of Education	Tuition and federal title programs—State Department of Education Head Start—State OEO Office.	Agreement may be made between public school and local OEO agency for Head Start.	1	0	19

Table III — Program Administration and Personnel Development (continued)

State	Administrative Agency		Form of Coordination Among Administrative Agencies	State Programs for Personnel Development		
	Kindergarten	Prekindergarten		No. of colleges with degree programs in early childhood education	No. of junior or community colleges with associate degree programs	No. of colleges with some work in early childhood education
Oregon	State Department of Education	State Department of Education	Informal and advisory.	0	3	6
Pennsylvania	State Department of Education	Departments of Welfare, Commerce, Education	A Governor's committee for child development and day care has been established as an interagency approach to meeting the needs of various federal, state and local programs.	6	8	27
Puerto Rico	The Office of Economic Opportunity and Private Institutions.	Urban Renewal Program. Social Services Department.	Informal and advisory on request from Department of Education.	0	0	3
Rhode Island	State Department of Education	State Department of Education	— —	4	0	4
South Carolina	State Department of Education	OEO and Head Start	None	4	1	12
South Dakota	State Department of Education	State Department of Education and Department of Public Welfare for Day Care programs.	Informal on day care and nursery.	0	0	10
Tennessee	State Department of Education	Department of Public Welfare and State Office of Economic Opportunity	Formal and advisory. State Department of Education has representative of State Day Care Advisory Comm. to State Department of Public Welfare and representatives on Governor's Interdepartmental Committee on Child Development.	15	0	Information not available.
Texas	State Department of Education	State Department of Education for Special Education. State Department of Public Welfare for Day Care Centers.	Governor's Council on Early Childhood Development	13	Not available	13
Utah	State Department of Education	State Department of Education works with districts having Head Start programs. Consultant service provided on request. State Welfare Department supervises Day Care Centers.	Informal, advisory	5	0	5
Vermont	State Department of Education	Day Care Licensing Unit, State OEO	Day Care licensing which includes any program accepting preschoolers has formal relationships in regulations and programming with state departments of education, public safety, environmental control, health and social welfare.	1	0	8

Table III — Program Administration and Personnel Development (continued)

State	Administrative Agency: Kindergarten	Administrative Agency: Prekindergarten	Form of Coordination Among Administrative Agencies	State Programs for Personnel Development: No. of colleges with degree programs in early childhood education	State Programs for Personnel Development: No. of junior or community colleges with associate degree programs	State Programs for Personnel Development: No. of colleges with some work in early childhood education
Virginia	State Department of Education	Department of Welfare and Institutions. Department of Health.	Informal Division of State Planning and Community Affairs.	16	16	32
Washington	State Department of Education	State Department of Education. Department of Public Assistance	Informal	4	2	15
West Virginia	State Department of Education	State Department of Education		10	0	1
Wisconsin	Local school districts and some nonpublic schools.	Local school districts and some nonpublic schools.	Nonpublic programs coordinated by nonpublic schools.	7	0	0
Wyoming	State Department of Education	State Welfare Department licenses day care centers.	...	0	0	1 (University of Wyoming)

Table IV — Certification Requirements and Administration

State	Certification Requirements For: Day Care Personnel	Kindergarten teachers and administrators	Kindergarten paraprofessionals	Prekindergarten teachers and administrators	Prekindergarten paraprofessionals	Agency Responsible for Certification	Elementary Certificate Applicable for Kindergarten and/or Prekindergarten Teaching
Alabama	No	No	No	No	No	No response	Yes, with endorsement of nursery and kindergarten.
Alaska	No	Yes	No	No	No	State Department of Education	Yes, certificate endorsed for early childhood.
American Samoa	No	No	No	No	No	Not applicable	No. Early childhood training required.
Arizona	No	Yes	No	No	No	State Department of Education	Yes. At present only certificate is issued.
Arkansas	No	Yes	No	No	No	State Department of Education Certified kindergarten teachers	Yes, but courses in kindergarten and early childhood education are required in addition to the regular elementary certificate.
California	No	Yes	No	No	No	For day care personnel and prekindergarten teachers and administrators, a children's center permit is required. It and kindergarten credentials are issued by Bureau of Education and Teacher Certification.	Yes

Table IV — Certification Requirements and Administration (continued)

State	Certification Requirements For: Day Care Personnel	Kindergarten teachers and administrators	Kindergarten paraprofessionals	Prekindergarten teachers and administrators	Prekindergarten paraprofessionals	Agency Responsible for Certification	Elementary Certificate Applicable for Kindergarten and/or Prekindergarten Teaching
Colorado	Licensing Require-ments	Yes	No	No	No	State Department of Education certifies kindergarten teachers. State Department of Social Services determines day care personnel qualifications for licensing purposes.	Yes
Connecticut	Yes*	Yes*	No	Yes*	No	State Department of Education *Only if operated under Board of Education.	Yes, if so endorsed by the preparing institution.
Delaware	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Day care is under Bureau of Child Development (Division of Social Services). All other personnel are certified by TEPS, State Department of Public Instruction.	No
Florida	No	Yes	No	No	No	State Department of Education	No
Georgia	No	Yes		Yes		State Department of Education *Criteria being developed	No
Guam	No	Yes	Yes	Admin.-Yes. Teacher-No.	. . .	State Department of Education	Yes
Hawaii	No	Yes	No	No	No	State Department of Education	Yes, for kindergarten
Idaho	No	Yes	No	No	No	No answer	No answer
Illinois	No	Yes	No	No	No	State Teacher Certification Board, Elementary School Certificate	Yes
Indiana	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Day care—State Department of Public Welfare; kindergarten teachers—State Department of Public Instruction.	Yes
Iowa	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Department of Public Instruction	Yes, for kindergarten. No, for prekindergarten.
Kansas	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	State Department of Education	Yes
Kentucky	No	Yes	No	No	No	State Department of Education	Yes, but this regulation will be changed effective Sept. 1, 1971.
Louisiana	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	State Department of Education	No
Maine	. .	Yes	.	No	No	State Department of Education	Yes, for kindergarten.
Maryland	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	State Department of Education	Yes. Certificate in Early Childhood Education.
Massachusetts	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	State Department of Education Public Health Department	Yes
Michigan	Yes	Yes (teachers only)	No	Yes (teachers only)	No	State Department of Education. Day care requirements handled through Department of Social Services. Prekindergarten teacher requirements applicable only if the program is connected with a public school.	Yes
Minnesota	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Department of Public Welfare licenses nursery schools. Department of Education for Prekindergarten and kindergarten personnel.	No
Mississippi	No	Yes	No	No	No	State Department of Education, Certification	Yes
Missouri	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	State Department of Education and State Colleges and Universities	Yes
Montana	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Applies to public kindergartens and prekindergartens conducted in public schools.	Yes
Nebraska	No	Yes	No	No	No	State Department of Education	Yes, for kindergarten.

Table IV — Certification Requirements and Administration (continued)

State	Certification Requirements For: Day Care Personnel	Kindergarten teachers and administrators	Kindergarten paraprofessionals	Prekindergarten teachers and administrators	Prekindergarten paraprofessionals	Agency Responsible for Certification	Elementary Certificate Applicable for Kindergarten and/or Prekindergarten Teaching
Nevada	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Day care personnel—Health, Welfare and Rehabilitation Department. Kindergarten teachers and administrators—State Department of Education.	Yes
New Hampshire	No	Yes	No	No	No	State Department of Education	Yes
New Jersey	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	State Department of Education	Nursery school and kindergarten endorsement.
New Mexico	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer
New York	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	State Education Department and cities of Buffalo and New York	Yes
North Carolina	No	Yes	No	No	No	State Department of Public Instruction	An Early Childhood Education Certificate is designed for teachers of the kindergarten primary level.
North Dakota	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	State Department of Public Instruction	Yes, with at least two courses in kindergarten dept.
Ohio	No	Yes	Permits for aides	No	No	State Department of Education	No, must have a kindergarten-primary certificate.
Oklahoma	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Teacher education and certification section of State Department of Education.	. . .
Oregon	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Day care—State Welfare Division. Kindergarten and prekindergarten—State Department of Education.	Yes
Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Departments of Education and Welfare	Yes
Puerto Rico	No	Yes	No	No	No	Department of Education	Yes
Rhode Island	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	State Department of Education	Yes
South Carolina	No	Teacher-yes. Admin.-no.	No	No	No	State Department of Education	Yes, provided 12 semester hours earned during the next 24 months following employment as a kindergarten teacher. This gives Early Childhood Education Certificate.
South Dakota	No	Yes	No	No	No	Department of Public Instruction	Yes
Tennessee	No	Yes	No	No	No	State Board of Education	Yes, with additional endorsement in K-3.
Texas	No	Yes (Teachers only)	No	Yes (Special ed. only)	No	Texas Education Agency	Yes, kindergarten endorsement.
Utah	No	Yes	No	Recommended	No	State Board of Education	Yes, nursery through grade 3
Vermont	No (in process)	Yes	No	No (in process)	No	State Department of Education and Training Colleges	. . .
Virginia	No	Yes	No	No	No	State Department of Education. Department has developed recommended guidelines for local districts for employment of paraprofessionals.	Yes
Washington	No	Yes	No	No	No	Superintendent of Public Instruction	Yes
West Virginia	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Welfare Department for day care. State Department of Education for kindergarten and prekindergarten.	No
Wisconsin	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Department of Public Instruction, if a part of a school district program. Certification of teachers to nonpublic schools is optional with the agency that operates them.	. . .
Wyoming	No	Yes	No	No	No	Certification and Placement Division of State Department of Education	Yes, with addition of one course in education with emphasis on kindergarten teaching.

ecs steering committee
1970-71

Chairman

*Governor Russell W. Peterson, Delaware

Vice Chairman

*William J. L. Wallace, President, West Virginia State College

Treasurer

*John E. Gray, Chairman, First Security National Bank, Beaumont, Texas

Members

*Governor Kenneth M. Curtis, Maine
Governor Luis A. Ferre, Puerto Rico
*Governor Tom McCall, Oregon
Governor Walter Peterson, New Hampshire
*Governor Calvin L. Rampton, Utah
Governor Robert W. Scott, North Carolina
Representative Darvin Allen, Kentucky
*Senator Bryce Baggett, Oklahoma
Senator Clarence E. Bell, Arkansas
Representative Charles W. Clabaugh, Illinois
Senator Oakley C. Collins, Ohio
*Representative D. Robert Graham, Florida
Representative Max H. Homer, Pennsylvania
Senator Richard D. Marvel, Nebraska
Denny G. Breaid, Association of Alaska School Boards
Cyril B. Busbee, State Superintendent of Education, South Carolina
Wilson H. Elkins, Presiden., University of Maryland
Mrs. Jerome Freiberg, Seattle, Washington
*Warren G. Hill, Chancellor of Higher Education, Connecticut
Richard H. Kosaki, Vice President, University of Hawaii
William P. Robinson, Jr., State Commissioner of Education, Rhode Island
Lyman Rowell, President Emeritus, University of Vermont
*Father Albert A. Schneider, Superintendent of Schools, Archdiocese of Stanta Fe, New Mexico
James E. Stratten, Member of the Board, California Department of Youth Authority
Frederick Thieme, President, University of Colorado
*Richard D. Wells, Indiana
Robert F. Williams, Executive Secretary, Virginia Education Association

Advisory Members

Governor William Cahill, New Jersey
Representative Ernest Allen, Idaho
Senator Halbert Harvill, Tennessee
Holger Rasmusen, Wisconsin
Representative Peter Turnham, Alabama
William J. Dodd, State Superintendent of Education, Louisiana
Everett Keith, Executive Secretary, Missouri Teachers Association
M. F. Peterson, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, North Dakota
Neil V. Sullivan, State Commissioner of Education, Massachusetts
Lawrence Wanlass, President, College of the Virgin Islands

---

*Executive Committee.